DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 989 HE 005 548

AUTHOR Theodore, Athena
TITLE Academic Women in Protest.
PUB DATE 28 Jan 74
NOTE 79p.; Expanded version of a paper presented at the annual meetin of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (New York, New York, August 25, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; Behavior Change; *Change Agents; *Females; Feminism; *Higher Education; Research Projects; *Sex Discrimination; Social Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper is an exploratory inquiry into some aspects of protest for sex equality by academic women. The analysis is based on published and unpublished information on sex discrimination in academia, as well as a sample of 65 cases of academic women obtained from a pilot survey. Following introductory material, Part II emphasizes patterns of response to sex discrimination including sensitizing academics, use of "regular" channels, confrontation, and activism outside academia. Part III reviews the effects of protest on the individual and on the institution. Part IV analyzes the accomplishments and failures derived from protesting women's stratagems. Part V, an overview of future response to the women's movement, discusses the corrective actions that should be taken by government agencies and professional associations as well as needed academic reforms. (MJM)

ED 091989

ACADEMIC WOMEN IN PROTEST

Athena Theodore
Associate Professor of Sociology
Simmons College

January 28, 1974

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Mailing Address:
27 Turning Mill Road
Lexington, Mass. 02173

HE 005 548

ACADEMIC WOMEN IN PROTEST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PATTERNS OF RESPONSE TO SEX DISCRIMINATION	2
	A. Sensitizing Academia	4
	B. Using the "Regular" Channels	7
	1. Getting One Foot in the Door	9
	2. Both Feet In?	14
	3. Administrative Tactics	18
	4. Counter Moves by the Protestors	22
	C. Confrontation	24
	1. Appeals to Women's Groups, Government Agencies, and Courts	25
	2. With the Deliberate Speed of a Turtle	28
	3. Open Warfare	29
	4. The Field After the Battle	35
	D. Activism Outside Academia	41
III.	THE EFFECTS OF PROTEST	44
	A. Impact on the Individual	45
	B. Effects on the Institution	49
IV.	ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND FAILURES: AN ANALYSIS	53
	A. Ideological Pronouncements	53
	B. Campus Politics	53
	C. Confrontation: What Has Gone Wrong?	59
	1. Administrative Resistance	60
	2. Ineffectiveness of the Government Agencies	64
	3. Lack of Precedence in Law	68
	D. Where Sisterhood Counts	69
V.	WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD?	71

ACADEMIC WOMEN IN PROTEST[1]

Athena Theodore
Associate Professor of Sociology
Simmons College

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent protest for sex equality by academic women has no precedent in the history of social movements in the United States. But following the thrust for admission by blacks on the nation's white campuses, the first attempts to effectuate reform by women in higher education occurred during the late sixties. These efforts had their origin through demonstrations by the women's caucuses of some of the male-dominated professional associations. The result was some encouraging gains, in particular the expanding participation of women in these organizations.

However, the gains have not been matched in the places where academic women work - on the campuses of the nation's colleges and universities. The well-documented inequities on the status and working conditions of academic women persist on a wide scale. The campus-based inequities also carry over into other academically related work organizations such as government granting agencies and private foundations sponsoring research.

The disappointing disparity in the movement for sex equality raises timely and pertinent questions. How are academic women responding to sexism and sex discrimination in their colleges and universities, and how effective are they in the resolution of their grievances when they ask for equal treatment?

Of course, the general problem demands an examination of developments far greater in scope and depth and more systematic than presently available time and resources permit. Hence this paper is no more than an exploratory inquiry into some important aspects of the problem. To some extent the analysis is based on published and unpublished information on sex discrimination in academia. However, the principal

---

[1]This is an expanded version of a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, New York City, August 25, 1973.

source is a sample of 65 cases of academic women obtained from a pilot survey.[2]

II. PATTERNS OF RESPONSE TO SEX DISCRIMINATION

Women encounter discriminatory experiences as individuals and in groups which range from subtle sexist practices to outright job exploitation. They experience inequities in the reward system such as denial of summer employment, sabbatical leaves, research funds, and co-authorship credit; and they are relegated to second-class citizenship by being given poor teaching schedules and other working conditions, as well as being excluded from teaching in graduate programs. But their main concern pertains to overt job discrimination in getting and keeping a job, in not being promoted and given tenure, and in being underpaid in comparison with their male colleagues in similar specialties.

What makes these academic women decide to challenge the system? Certainly the supporting atmosphere of the women's movement provides a strong incentive. But specific incidents and conditions may spark the action, only a few of which can be cited here. Often a single event may force the woman to protest: a blatantly exploitative salary offer, a rejection of a recommended promotion or tenure, the stark

---

[2]The sample was obtained from responses to an unstructured questionnaire which was mailed to a select group of academic women who were known to be active in the movement. In addition to several basic variables, respondents were asked to give a brief description of the situation, identifying the sexism or discrimination relative to their cases, describing their counter stratagems, successes and failures, and indicating the resulting impact on themselves, others, and changes in the institution. Although this is a relatively small sample of convenience, it represents a fairly good cross section of academic women with respect to geographic location and size of institution, discipline, professorial rank, marital status, and age. Since no statistical estimation or quantification is intended, the sample may serve our probing objective.

Given ample time and resources, a systematic study of the subject would require a more sophisticated sample design than the present pilot study. For example, it would be necessary to identify first the relevant statistical population and then select a stratified random sample from the frame. Also, it would be desirable to survey some administrators and examine, among other matters, ways and procedures which might resolve grievances more expeditiously and constructively than would otherwise be the case. Finally, an examination of the role of the government agencies, the women's groups and organizations, and other non-campus-based individuals and groups involved in these cases would offer the most comprehensive view of the present problem.

salary figures of a recent report on sex discrimination, a new policy stating ineligibility as a part-time employee for a foundation grant, the appearance of new rules without precedent or cause, a decision to eliminate a position, a sudden and unexpected firing. In other situations the woman may decide to fight back because she has nothing to lose. Finally, it may be that the weariness of years of debasing treatment and inaction after many bona fide attempts to secure equality through hard work and demonstrated competence has at last reached home.

The responses of academic women to this state of affairs range from subtle maneuvers to open defiance and confrontation. Sometimes the incident is accompanied bu demonstrations and wide publicity, involving the entire campus:

> "Several years ago I was 'fired,' that is, given a terminal contract when I applied for promotion to the rank of associate professor. No reasons were given. This happened shortly after the appearance of my book. I was known to be a feminist and to espouse radical views. The students organized demonstrations, circulated petitions, picketed, and painted buildings. Some junior faculty organized a teach-in at which 'fired' professors from other universities, together with myself and some students, spoke. The affair was given wide publicity in the media. After many weeks of such a struggle, the university was compelled to create committees to deal with the problem. The university academic senate elected a faculty hearing committee which spent approximately two weeks interviewing members of the university community."

But more frequently than not, academic women are involved in protracted and repeated appeals to compliance agencies and government officials:

> "I have asked the EEOC state officer to use his influence. He has written two letters to the state commission with no results. I have written to the Governor to apprise him of non-action; he referred his letter to the EEOC state officer. I have asked my local representative and senator to use their influence; they have written the Commission and called."

The process of seeking redress to their grievances is invariably accompanied by a nearly endless exchange of both verbal and written communication. Telephone calls, letters, memoranda, committee reports, tape recordings, and numerous other types of documentation pass back and forth between the woman and her departmental colleagues and chairperson, administrators at all levels, standing or ad hoc committees, hearing boards, the local and national American Association of University Professors, government compliance officials, lawyers, public officials, and women's groups, students, and other individuals both inside and outside the campus. As is evident from the above examples, the process covers weeks, months, and even years of time.

In general, we may distinguish four response patterns by academic women to correct inequities: (1) sensitizing or consciousness-raising on sexism and sex discrimination; (2) seeking redress to grievances on employment discrimination through institutional procedures; (3) seeking redress to grievances on employment discrimination through appeals to government agencies, courts, and other outside groups and organizations; and (4) working off campus in the women's movement.

A woman may be involved in one, several, or all four response patterns at any one time; in many cases all the patterns may represent different stages on a time continuum, indicating increasingly deeper involvement in a grievance process in her own behalf, in behalf of others, or in both. Moreover, for individual cases there may be no discernibly sharp lines of demarcation between the responses. However, regardless of the lack of refinement in the above four general patterns of response, they nevertheless constitute a useful conceptual arrangement which permits an effective presentation of the composite picture of protest by academic women.

Further explanation of the above, using examples taken from the cases of the 65 respondents, will be followed by an analysis of the accomplishments and failures of the protesting women based on the findings of this study.

A. Sensitizing Academia

Academic women utilize their vantage point on the campus in order to sensitize academia about sexism and sex discrimination. Because cultural manifestations of sexist attitudes and practices are so pervasive, it becomes necessary to point this out to colleagues, both male and female, and to attempt to raise the consciousness level of the entire academic community until change takes place:

> "For five years I was repeatedly asked to serve coffee at faculty-student functions and to be secretary of committees. I repeatedly refused. Most of the committees I've served on lately don't have secretaries."

Sexist pronouncements uttered during lectures also receive suggestions for action. Both faculty and students may be the targets:

"I fight sexism wherever I see it. For example, when I noticed in the zerox room a statement to medical students using 'he' or 'she' for patients but 'he' for doctors, I sent the doctor a note and he changed it. More controversially, when it was reported to me that a physiologist started his lecture on the liver to the students with 'This is going to be very difficult: it will be like rape, so relax and enjoy it,' I bought him an anti-rape poster from the graphics collective of the Chicago Women's Liberation Union, and wrote him a letter, suggesting that rape was not funny and in the future he should make jokes only at the expense of groups to which he belongs - white middle-class men. I had some other faculty and students sign it. He freaked. Now when someone makes a sexist remark, the class warns, 'You'll get a letter!'"

In such counter stratagems the women are not acting in their academic roles but as members of the female sex. They may remind, admonish, scold, or in some way bring to the attention of others the need to change sexist attitudes and practices. They accomplish their objectives through both subtle and direct expressions of disapproval in departmental and committee meetings and, more effectively, during informal encounters, at campus social gatherings, and through their classroom teaching, especially in courses concerning women.

Not all women express their protests as vociferously as the examples above may suggest. Sensitizing one's self is a prelude to sensitizing others:

"My position here is that of being the only woman in the department. People are quite obviously not used to having a woman around except in secretarial status. Now I feel a commitment to be available to the women students, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Already in my few short months here I can feel this need and have begun to be of some help. However, I have also noticed a great many women who are 'unliberated' and would actually like nothing else."

This respondent has yet to create great waves on her campus but she is beginning to see herself as a subject of sex discrimination with a task ahead of her, unlike the following respondent who has 'made' it in academia and whose consciousness has reached a certain level and stopped there:

"I have tenure, have received accelerated promotion, have had every consideration in my department. As I see it, many women in academia do not press for administrative posts and more responsibility (and better paid positions) because they are already handling two full-time jobs - teaching and family. That is my situation. I know that more women should be department chairmen, deans, vice-presidents, etc., but I don't want more responsibility so I am hesitant to bandstand for representation in these areas."

At the same time, the above remarks also point to a problem that may beset academic women as well as other women - how to allocate time between work and home; however, it is interesting that no other respondent even suggested that this was a problem.

The consciousness-raising function in the activities of campus women's groups is also manifested in the support provided to individual women. A newly appointed instructor illustrates how a women's group has made her the beneficiary of a feeling called "sisterhood":

> "I have contacted and been contacted by the women's faculty group on campus and expect to develop this relationship. I find their existence in many ways a great comfort when I am feeling down."

Another academic woman active in an outside women's organization speaks of the importance of expanding even further both the concepts of consciousness-raising and sisterhood as one interrelated objective for her campus:

> "In spite of these problems, however, progress is being made - mainly in the minds of women faculty members. They are becoming more aggressive in their discontent, at least to the point of discussing their problems with each other and in some cases organizing into effective organs for change. They are becoming aware that they have legal recourses and are daring to use them. We aren't going to see more dramatic changes on campuses until this consciousness-raising continues and increases and women become more vociferous and more adept at using what pressure is available to them. I think the counter to sex discrimination is just beginning and a great deal lies ahead. But it <u>is</u> beginning, and there is no turning back."

The act of sensitizing others in the academic community goes beyond changing definitions of sex roles. Consciousness-raising is also focused on the academic role, especially with respect to the status of women on the person's own campus. Frequently, the woman's statement of her personal grievances may be diffused with remarks about her male colleagues:

> "Younger male colleagues are more open and willing to discuss the problem of sex discrimination than their older colleagues, but this is effectively cancelled out by the fact that there is very much more job insecurity and competition in the younger age bracket. Older men, including those with tenure, just don't want to listen. They probably feel residual guilt at having exploited their own wives and fear a threat to their own comfort and convenience from a domestic revolt. When I raise the matter, they invariably point to the fact that the employment situation in physics is extremely bad now for men as well as women, which is especially infuriating coming from the lips of those who denied me entry into the physics profession five years ago when the job market was many times more favorable:"

The appearance of reports and other information documenting sex discrimination often constitutes the most important part in this consciousness-raising response pattern because it has an impact on the greatest number of women. For it is at this

point that academic women first begin to assess their own positions seriously and plan their moves relative to anticipated moves from their administrations and possibly others:

> "I had done two things when the situation seemed impossible: (1) I began to record incidents with specifics regarding names, dates, places, episodes, (2) I saw an excellent feminist lawyer so I would be able to put the situation in a legal perspective and negotiate on strength and knowledge rather than fear. Meanwhile, I was teaching myself about law: what is really evidence as opposed to hearsay, how does one logically and forcefully write a 'case,' what non-rational aspects of the situation are operative, and how do I most effectively respond? I finally got a 'plan of action.' I would 'appeal.' My friends told me this almost never was done; noone ever wins out. But on principle, even though I could not win, certain issues needed to be discussed in full with the president."

In addition, the legitimacy of written reports, even those conducted under auspices other than those of the administration, are also directed towards reaching the widest possible audience in the campus and local newspapers. Here is an excerpt from the report of a campus-based women's group:

> "During the initial year the Committee of Women on Campus has been involved in these actions: carrying out meetings and forums to discuss issues of women's equal treatment and equal opportunities on the University campus; suggesting lists of qualified women candidates for openings in professional positions on the staff and faculty; preparing and submitting to the chancellor an affirmative action plan; presenting a prospectus to the Chancellor's Office for a university-wide program to bring men and women into 'rare' fields - professions not traditionally followed by women, such as engineering, physics, business administration, and for men fields such as early childhood education, language, English, and social work."

It is important to emphasize that any gains in sensitizing male colleagues and administrators should be carefully weighted against the possibility of creating a hostile environment from backlash. It is one thing to utter sexist jokes to students, as did the male professor in an earlier example: there was no immediate threat to his position or to his status in that case. But it is quite another thing when competence is the issue, as in the following situation of an outstanding teacher:

> "In this environment it is almost as though anything good I might do is defined as bad. When I won the highly coveted graduate teaching award, not one of the full professors congratulated me. In fact, the scuttlebut started the next day that teaching awards went to persons who fed students beer and spaghetti. (I've never even fed them coke!)"

As yet no formal and specific grievances have been advanced requesting prompt and positive action. Nevertheless, we may have gleaned from the statements of some of our respondents that a significant aspect of the first response pattern is the belief, in spite of doubts and discouraging statements, that sex inequities will be corrected, even belatedly, within the campus boundaries with administrative initiative. But, as we know, wishful thinking never changed the status quo. The accounts of our respondents show that unless someone rises to protest such inequities openly, not much will happen for academic women beyond the recognition that a problem exists.

3. Using the "Regular Channels"

Sensitizing and consciousness-raising are primarily directed towards correcting sexist practices in the academic community, sometimes even resulting in an administrative response to begin the process of eliminating sex discrimination among faculty women. More frequently, administrative failure to respond favorably may move some women to take matters into their own hands. This is particularly so when sex discriminatory policies and practices relate specifically to their own employment terms and conditions of work. This action constitutes a first step in the grievance process, following a patient (and often long) wait while general appeals and recommendations continue to bring no improvement.

Some of the remarks already quoted point out the magnitude of the task ahead, if not a sense of hopelessness, even before any specific grievances are presented; on the other hand, even extensive unsuccessful efforts concerning specific grievances do not mark the limit of one's endurance:

> "Six months earlier I had politely talked to the trustees about these issues but lack of action and commitment in the ensuing six months indicated these ideas were not taken seriously by the administration; i.e., they were passively allowing discrimination by not making wholehearted efforts to remedy inequalities."

It should be emphasized even before we examine the second response pattern that the difficulties women encounter in academia begin even while they are still in graduate

school, where their bargaining power is weak, to say the least:

> "When I was at grad school a new professor attempted to 'seduce' me both intellectually and sexually, asking that I drive him home after evening classes, plying me with French wine, etc. I rejected his advances and discussed my case with other grad students and a former woman professor who had been my first advisor and helped me in obtaining my grad assistantship. At my oral exams he proceeded to try to discredit both my thesis and my former advisor. Finally, without my breakdown or any support from the other committee members, he relented, stating that the drilling was just part of the 'rites of passage.'"

Another student has a more dramatic variation on the same theme:

> "In order to pass my prelims, I prostituted my body. In order to have my dissertation accepted, I am prostituting my mind. The body prostitution was successfully executed; the mind prostitution is still in process."

Intellectual competence seems to be especially under fire in graduate school disguised in unexpected ways:

> "I believe the oral examination for my dissertation was an extreme case of anti-female prejudice. Certainly it was the occasion of the most personally wounding attack I ever experienced. Briefly, the meeting started off with a bitter criticism of my prose style and germanic length sentences. Not ever having learned my place, I responded with a vigorous defense. It was all down hill after that. One of my committee members actually referred to me as 'Ilsa Koch.' The research was eventually published, and the discovery that I had made serendipitiously was later independently replicated by another investigator."

The second stage or response pattern usually begins with a special request for improving the terms of employment. It is usually addressed to the department head or immediate superior. Beyond this point the specific grievance takes an erratic course which varies from one campus to the next. Irrespective of direction, the appeal process is usually long and arduous, as well as frequently painful and disappointing. It may involve repeating over and over the well-documented information to intermediary committees and administrators up to the college president or university chancellor. Not infrequently, it is during this stage that the grievance process becomes an adversary relationship, a state of events on which we will focus later.

1. <u>Getting One Foot in the Door</u>.

Many women report that they occupy marginal positions of temporary or part-time employment. Usually, these positions are not on the "tenure track." Furthermore, in many cases the terms of employment are quite unfavorable and exploitative compared with similar positions held by men:

"The following two academic years were spent working essentially full-time but unsalaried here on other department members' research projects, using their research and computer funds. At the same time, two white male research workers were working in the same area at salaries of approximately $10,000 per annum each and produced far less research than I did."

An appointment may also be marginal by being in a department or program which is outside the woman's discipline or in an area peripheral to her own specialty, as the following remarks reveal:

"I was called in by the acting head of the Psychology Department to see if I would help teach the introductory course. He was very straightforward in pointing out that it was not a position that carried consideration for faculty tenure, but of course I hoped that point would be reconsidered. After some discussion I was accorded the title of Visiting Assistant Professor. The university was in a bind that year for a statistics teacher, so they also, at my insistence, gave me that title."

Nepotism rules also are cited as one administrative policy barring the employment of otherwise qualified academic women, although such practices are discriminatory and illegal. Despite the double standard implied in nepotism, the department may have little choice but to follow the university's policy:

"I had particular difficulty in obtaining employment due to the previous existence of a nepotism rule at our institution. (My husband is also an economist.) During the time I sought employment there, male economists were hired with lower qualifications, and I was not. In the end, the nepotism rule was overturned, but I had to work part-time until that happened."

But nepotism rules may also be conveniently abandoned by a department:

"The university refused to hire me except on a part-time basis because my husband was in the same department, theoretically because of a 'law' against nepotism. My husband, who was tenured and an established scholar, resigned and left. I was then hired full-time by the department. My husband was then re-hired, and we both now have tenure. Of course, the danger here is that the husband might be dealt out: we commuted for two years (800 miles by air) before everything was straightened out. In our case the stratagem worked."

Perhaps the greatest degree of exploitation for academic women occurs when they accept part-time appointments. Such an appointment, unlike that of most male academicians, usually constitutes the woman's only employment. Although practices perceived as exploitative vary, discrimination typically reaches the point of being blatantly overt in part-time employment, as in the following case:

"My lectureship is temporary part-time work, according to the university, but I really have a full-time load in the fall term and a 2/3 load in the spring. My contract is for one term at a time and my pay is $1,500 per course. This spring I was selected for a grant of $2,000 from the National Endowment

for the Humanities, but I could not not receive the grant because my appointment was not a 'regular' appointment. Had my position been one in which I might make 'future contributions' by teaching, I would have been eligible to receive the award. I am fully qualified to hold an Assistant Professorship as I have a Ph.D. and two publications. I complained to the English Department that the terms of my appointment were unfairly excluding me from receiving grants or stipends from NEH. The department passed a regulation that they would 'study' the circumstances of the lecturer and attempt to insure 'professional status' for the lecturer's position as an appointment of 'indefinite duration,' meaning that I would be assured of employment as long as the enrollment of students in freshman English (the only classes I am allowed to teach) remained constant. I am not particularly optimistic that women who hold such lectureships will be granted real professional recognition soon. That position has traditionally been reserved for graduate students, but in practice is mainly limited to faculty wives with masters' degrees whose pay per course is even less than that given me."

Exploitation may even constitute one's entire career pattern, as the same woman goes on to say:

"Prior to receiving my present lectureship I was a part-time instructor in the English Department of ____. This position, like the lectureship, was sometimes in practice a full-time load (at 1/4 the pay of an assistant professor) and was likely to continue from one term to another. My pay was $1,000 per course, the same pay as a graduate student received. (I had a Ph.D. at the time.)"

Appeals on specific grievances do not always end at the departmental level, even by women who occupy marginal part-time positions not on a career path. When a "majority" of the departmental faculty are against a woman's admission to the "club," she may appeal her case. Unfortunately, even successful appeals outside the department to administrators at higher levels and various faculty committees may not be able to overturn a departmental decision:

"In the fall of 1970 I taught a graduate course in my field of specialty; student evaluations placed me highest in the department. Two years later I was contacted to teach the course again. Instead of proceeding with hiring me, the course was abruptly cancelled by the department after a two-hour meeting. Reportedly, they were concerned with the possibility of my getting 'a foot in the door.' After this crass example of unprofessional behavior, I appealed to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the university Affirmative Action Committee, which pressured the department to reinstate the course. This accomplished, and still mad, I applied for a regular position in the department. A job opening with specifications fitting me exactly had been approved in 1970 but had never been filled. To make a long story short, months of wrangling ensued, with a minority of the department favoring my being hired and the Dean of A&S coming in on my behalf. The upshot was that the department was successful in claiming that they had no position available and did not need to hire. Arguing in my behalf was Women's Caucus, Women's Studies Board, the Union, the Dean, and the local newspaper. They could not budge the department. After all this, I filed an EEOC complaint last February, hired a feminist attorney, and am suing for the job, back pay, etc."

Departmental resistance to full-time employment does not stop at eliminating the position, despite the qualifications of the female candidate and her proven competence. Ways are found to create demeaning circumstances which are felt to be practiced because of one's sex. A case in point is that of a woman who went through a re-hiring review in order to legitimize her de facto full-time faculty status in a department where she had taught for several years as a part-time lecturer:

> "With a change in department chairman, I decided this spring to request full-time status - it means only one more course to teach since I am already engaged in virtually full-time professional activities and which will result, of course, in a doubling of salary. The Chairman and the Executive Council, however, chose to regard this request as an application for a position and I was informed that I should submit my vita for departmental evaluation. I refused to allow this to happen because, I said, I have taught in this department for seven years; during the first four I was teaching on a semester-to-semester basis. After I refused - and with considerable supportive input to me on the part of a number of other (principally senior) faculty members, - it was decided that the decision would be made by the Executive Council. The Council voted my change from part to full-time status unanimously. However, it did so with considerably more discussion than I feel the issue deserved. My vita was circulated in the Council. I feel that I was submitted to still another 'hiring' review and I resent it terribly. In the course of all this, I was reminded several times by my chairman that I was placing myself in jeopardy of being denied tenure and losing my job while, in my previous part-time circumstance, this would not happen. I told him I was willing to take the risk - and I am - but I feel this constitutes some harassment nonetheless."

In addition, the female candidate for full-time status must contend with practices involving double standards in admission and qualifications, the "buddy system," and with manipulated facts to conceal discrimination, as is pointed out in the following excerpt from a women's group writing to a university chancellor in behalf of a female candidate who was turned down for a position:

> "It appears, furthermore, that women are asked to join what are, in fact, rigged competitions, since the Department considers itself formally or informally bound to some, but not all, of the candidates. In this case, a woman was supposed to compete on 'equal' terms with two male candidates who had already been favorably reviewed in the past by the faculty. For a woman to be chosen in these conditions, she should have had such extraordinary qualifications, that hiring her at a junior rank would have been offensive.
>
> "It appears from the Department's commitments that lectureships are not offered to white males without at least informal promises about the future, while ethnic minorities and females can be offered token appointments to dead-end positions. We consider that this double standard clearly perpetuates discriminatory patterns, while attempting to conceal discrimination in the overall statistics."

Part of the difficulty in finding suitable employment is attributable to the

highly specialized training which academicians receive. The specialization problem may be compounded for academic women when they seek employment. Here is the stratagem used by one woman in order to overcome the sex-related inequities which women usually encounter in competing with men in the academic marketplace:

> "There were no jobs in my original field. I was, I believe, the first woman to get a Ph.D. from my school in the study of religion. Given that I had all A's and splendid recommendations, I could have followed a career in this subject had I wished to remain unmarried and teach at some place like Altavista, West Virginia for the rest of my life. I chose instead to use my undergraduate major, which was also my graduate school minor, in Social Relations and to advertise myself as a sociologist at a time when the market for sociologists was quite open. In other words, my strategy was to change fields, first from religion to sociology, and then to anthropology when a department chairman during an interview told me that I was an anthropologist and that I was going to start an anthropology major. I kept my mouth shut - I wasn't an anthropologist at the time, but I wanted the job. This kind of thing isn't really lying, but an 'imaginative' reworking of one's background for the combat that goes on in job hunting. I have acquired a real estate license to fall back on when the whole teaching bit becomes too much - at least this gives me a feeling of independence when I look at prospective jobs and makes me hold out for a higher salary or position. I may wind up as a small businesswoman yet; at least I must think of alternatives to the tenured professoriate."

Of course, men as well as women find it difficult nowadays to obtain suitable employment in their fields because of a tight employment market. This is particularly true in many of the highly specialized hard science fields where women are minimally represented and which puts them at a strong disadvantage in the communication networks of the "buddy system." After discounting market conditions, however, one cannot deny the possibility that the employment histories of our respondents, such as those cited above, are not free of sex discriminatory practices.

By contrast, exceptionally qualified women find it difficult to obtain employment even when they have all the credentials, academic honors, experience, and publications:

> "I have been unable to get a job for this academic year. I have written 60-100 letters and the only job I was offered was a one-year replacement for a man on a fellowship with no prospects of reappointment. It is possible that my being a feminist has something to do with this situation. I cannot get a grant to revise my feminist dissertation into a book. In my position with NOW I have heard so many horror stories about women with superb gifts and credentials. In the case my local chapter filed against a local university, I learned so many disillusioning things about the academic establishment that finally I began to feel that especially in this very tight job market it was not necessarily my record which couldn't compete, but my feminism which was threatening."

It is evident that academic women active in the movement are especially vulnerable to a permanent state of unemployment even before they have lifted one finger in protest.

2. Both Feet In?

No less serious are the problems and tribulations of academic women occupying full-time "regular" positions. This would include women who have tenure and enjoy the security which tenure brings.

In the first place, outrightly exploitative treatment because of one's sex is often perceived by our respondents as they compare themselves with male colleagues:

> "In our meeting the president said openly that if he could hire a woman for $6,000, he would, when he might have to pay a similarly qualified man $12,000."

This is precisely because these males constitute important reference groups in a professional context:

> "I was expected to share my office with the two female graduate students since it was thought that they would be more comfortable there than in the graduate student room which, by custom, was all male. I protested this vigorously and successfully, although in the long run it proved to be a mistake as my assertiveness was used against me."

Respondents are particularly sensitive to the injustice of being placed in demeaning and degrading situations which accentuate their second-class citizenship:

> "Sexist attitudes have become even more blatant. The culmination of the daily degrading treatment of women, which is far more damaging than salary inequities and professional advancement, came when the women were purposely and rudely ignored at a meeting of the state trustees board to which they had been previously invited."

Perhaps no statement summarizes more effectively the extent to which academic women who occupy regular positions can be exploited and mistreated than the following:

> "For two years I tried to peacefully negotiate within the department, but power inequities made my bargaining position weak. The department policy involved discrimination in not allowing me equal participation in department discussions and decision making, unequal course assignments, unequal choice of content courses, inequitable course loads, discriminatory interference in my courses, and departmental toleration of harassment. The final discriminatory act was the department's recommendation to the president that I be replaced."

But when exploitation reaches intolerable levels and a woman appeals for correction of inequities, her appeals fall into bureaucratic quicksand, as the following respondent narrates:

"I tried the channel approach first. The result was that the Affirmative Action Officer denied my four meetings with her. She is the Assistant Dean and the token woman. Also, the Dean fired me over the phone. There was much intimidation. Then I went to the Internal Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. The result was that they found sex discrimination but I really had to push them to the wall. Two members of the committee, both token women, voted against sex discrimination (or were not understanding of women, I believe) because they thought my voice was too sweet - 'not harsh enough.' I tried to get an academic hearing for seven months."

Often it is possible for exploitation to take place because the college or university lacks appropriate procedures for hearing grievances, as the preceding example illustrates. But, in addition, even when an academic woman succeeds in having such procedures established in order to resolve her grievance, it is possible for administrators to undermine important principles of "due process" to which all faculty members in higher education are supposedly entitled:

"I appealed the decision of not having my contract renewed to a designated faculty committee - the Senate Subcommittee on Academic Freeedom. Now they have these procedures - first you appeal, then a group looks into the situation and makes an informal recommendation; if it isn't accepted, then you have formal hearings. So I got the investigation. They found that I had been denied due process and that evidence had not been considered (for example, my work for two years in women's liberation was not considered service to the community). During the summer (no students around), the department met, decided that there was no reason to reconsider, and so nothing changed. I appealed to the other committee in November of the next semester and did not hear from them until the Spring. Supposedly they met last week to decide <u>whether or not</u> to hear my case - I still haven't heard. This little sketch gives an idea about the 'asministrative remedies' supposedly guaranteed to faculty members in the Faculty Manual."

Further, sex discriminatory policies and practices appear to be equally prevalent in the application of two important criteria for promotion - teaching competence and professional productivity in the form of publications.

On the issue of teaching competence, the term is subject to such broad interpretation as to defy any attempt for a working definition. For example, it may include the content of the teaching material which, in the judgment of those making decisions concerning a faculty woman's professional future, may be considered to be "inappropriate," but which, in fact, raises important questions of academic freedom:

"The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the college recommended non-promotion from instructor to assistant professor on grounds of teaching competence, saying, among other things, that I used a non-academic text in my course (Our Bodies, Our Selves). In one meeting with the committee I was questioned for an hour on the book with the implication that I was teaching propaganda -

encouraging students to masturbate, engage in premarital sex, use birth control, and explore their personal problems with homosexuality in class. I immediately sent a personal challenge to the chairman of the committee and taped an interview with him about the logic of the recommendation. I appealed to the president of the college to overrule the committee, and to the department faculty who in turn informed their and my students. Students, teachers, and the department as a whole sent letters to the president, refuting the committee's claim that I was not competent and arguing that the education was relevant, necessary, and appropriate for the students. Some letters were clear about the sexism of denying a teacher the right to teach women about themselves, and thus denying the women the right and opportunity to learn it. The president received about 40-50 letters in three days."

On the other important criterion for advancement - professional publications - sex discriminatory practices may take several directions. One of these concerns the question of authorship status and the right to publish work in which the academic woman has had a partial or even major share in its creation:

"Five years after completion and copyrighting of my dissertation, I still have not been able to obtain permission from my dissertation advisor to publish it either in full or in part, either jointly with him or on my own."

The norm of "publish or perish" in academia may sometimes incite a woman to take action which will place her credentials in a more competitive position and raise her status in her own field. Sometimes the strategy works, as in the following case:

"During 1969-70 I wrote a paper at the request of a male medical colleague concerning research findings from a project in which he had originally written a proposal and obtained funding. The paper was submitted to the American Psychiatric Association for presentation at their annual meeting with his name as first author, and he subsequently read the paper at that meeting. A panel who heard it approved it for publication in the American Journal of Psychiatry. Due to my efforts to raise his consciousness regarding women's and Ph.D.'s status, he grandly said <u>my</u> name could be first, although he said he had first intended to have his name as first author (although I had written it <u>in toto</u> and did or supervised the research <u>in toto</u>, occasionally even disregarding his wishes or dictates). He subsequently encouraged me to apply for a grant in my own name, which the Psychiatry Service Chief who had left would not have permitted."

If the issue of sex discrimination is not pressed vigorously or debated openly, a good record of publications may prove to be a successful route to advancement:

"The only thing I really did was to try to publish my head off so no one would have any excuses. This year, four books and a number of articles in the best journals later, I finally made it to associate professor at a 'good' department (not distinguished or strong). I do believe I have enough stuff published to bet by for full professor but I won't worry about that now."

But publishing one's head off may not necessarily be the solution to career mobility:

"I still feel the best stratagem is to be superwoman; I had two books in press when re-hired. But of course even being superwoman might <u>not</u> work!"

in fact, professional publications may bring on a state of unemployability. Here is a case where a woman who had fought openly for equal treatment found that she was unemployable, despite her extraordinary achievements:

> "I find myself unable to get a job, wasting four university diplomas. Currently I have 28 professional publications, 19 professional presentations, and ten years' successful teaching experience."

Beyond the problems which credentialism bring to academic women, the stated or understood policies are not always in accordance with actual practices on some campuses. For sometimes the criteria suddenly change when a woman comes up for tenure, that critical moment when the "up or out" decision must be made. Teaching competence, for example, may cease to be important even though the professor was hired to teach and those in a position to know - the students - come up strongly in her defense. The following excerpt from a college student newspaper illustrates the case in point where the respondent had been deluged with 750 student signatures in her behalf from both current and graduated students:

> "I have never in my four years of college education experienced an instructor with such a love and understanding of her field, with the means by which to communicate it in the true manner of the 'art of teaching.' I thnk that the size of classes and the loyalty of her students, to whom she gave so much, will certainly attest to her teaching ability."

The evaluative criteria may also vanish altogether when a woman comes up for tenure, as another campus newspaper reports about a respondent fighting for her job,

> "There was no indication in the faculty code that the criteria for tenure was any different than the criteria for reappointment."

followed by an explanation as to why the code was no longer in operation:

> "In a note to Ms.___ notifying her of the tenure decision taken in her case, Professor ___ had pointed to the'realities of our tenure situation' in forcing the 'step taken with regret' in denying her tenure. He testified yesterday that with 13 or 14 younger professors in the department and only two or three vacancies forseeable in the next 10 to 15 years, the department had to be 'very, very prudent in our decisions in deciding not to recommend Ms. ___ for tenure.' Asked if other members in the department were concerned with the tenure situation, he replied that they were 'acutely aware of it.'"

It is interesting to note in this case that the incident occurred in a prominent women's college in a department consisting of 15 men and 9 women, of which 13 of the men were tenured and only four of the women.

In general, the consensus of respondents runs as follows: a woman may be judged solely on the basis of the criterion regarding productivity, although no written policy is provided and male colleagues without publications have been advanced. The publication issue is particularly important in graduate departments of large prestigious universities where an academic woman must show "superior" performance according to the evaluative criteria, philosophical bias, or even subspecialty currently in fashion in the department. Furthermore, exactly what this "superior" performance consists of at the time may be or is likely to be defined more by sex-related factors than by her actual academic achievements. What seems to count mostly is an affirmative answer to the question, "Is she a good buddy?"

3. Administrative Tactics.

It has already been shown that, unlike consciousness raising, attempts to find redress to specific grievances may, and frequently do, receive considerable resistance from our respondents' own colleagues and administrative officials. However, despite the fact that decisions affecting her future may rest with the department, grievances are often taken outside the department following failure to find redress within. In any case, since final authority usually rests with higher administrative officials who have the power to overturn departmental and committee recommendations, it is here that we must look for the kinds of tactics which are used to keep academic women in their place.

But first we must remind our readers that even before an academic woman raises her voice in protest, like other women she has to deal with the female stereotypes which are sure to come her way. More frequently than not, this takes place when she ventures to question the judgment or authority of her male superiors, especially if they also happen to be her employers. One newspaper account describing the local scene of sex discrimination in the neighboring campuses sums it up rather nicely:

> "Women who have experienced problems with university administrations are told that the problem is a 'personality conflict' rather than results of underlying sexist attitudes. Ms. ___ found herself classified as being 'particularly sensitive,' 'over-reacting,' a 'difficult woman,' a 'hysterical female,' 'uncooperative,' and 'immoral.'"

The first line of defense on the part of administrators is to deny that any sex discrimination exists at all: what has really been occurring in academia over the past century is something else. One administrator calls it "oversights," as this respondent indicates:

> "The next action taken by the President was in summer when he wrote to us saying he had completed his study and found five women and one man to be underpaid as a result, not of discrimination, but of oversights. He also revealed what had been used to determine whether the salary a faculty member received was equitable. Among other criteria, he listed 'willingness to accept offer proferred.'"

Secrecy, often used under the name of "confidentiality," seems to be the first line of defense for most administrators. This tactic makes the academic woman especially powerless to respond or to take action in her own behalf. It begins even as the academic novice prepares to find her way into academia:

> "There were unfair and professionally damaging secret recommendations from professors in my dossier. The letter one of my professors wrote for me was put first in my confidientail dossier, and when some kindly interviewer showed it to me four years later, I was appalled. I prevailed upon the Dean of my school to get the professor involved to remove his letter, not without considerable difficulty. The Dean was on my side, but the professor thought his letter was performing a service to his colleagues. He was upset because I had breached 'professional ethics' and seen my confidential dossier even though he had character assassinated me and several other students who also had to remove his letters from their dossiers. I think it is imperative that every woman who has not seen what her professors are saying about her should get ahold of her file. The easiest way is to have a friend teaching at another institution send for it and then forward it to the candidate. For people who don't have any friends in a position to do this (graduate students who don't know anyone who can pose as an employer), organizations such as Sociologists for Women in Society should set up a list of people who will get your file for you. We are facing 'recommendation escalation' and might as well play the game."

Later we shall see how character assassination may adversely affect a woman's professional career.

Additionally, if the intention of the administration is to do nothing, committees may be used as devices to thwart action:

> "The members of the committee were bound by 'confidentiality' and therefore their decision could be either accepted or rejected by the president. The president did in fact accept their evidence and decided in my favor. As a result I received a promotion and tenure several months after the terminal contract was issued."

And departments can also employ secrecy tactics if the administrators decide to look the other way:

"Despite the university's clear regulations on hiring practices, the opening of these positions was never publicly advertised. The secrecy with which the department surrounds its hiring procedures prevents any input from graduate students, special interest groups such as ours, or nationwide groups and committees of the Association. This policy of secrecy casts doubts upon the manner in which the department is complying with the search procedures stipulated by the Affirmative Action guidelines."

Closely related to secrecy in its use as an administrative defense are delaying tactics. These take all kinds of forms. Bouncing the ball back and forth between department and administration, setting up another committee to investigate, or advocating the desirability of awaiting the completion of an Affirmative Action Plan are all examples of such tactics. Here is one statement by a respondent which includes other elements as well:

"Since becoming involved on this University Committee on the Status of Women (as co-chairperson), many incidents have occurred. We wanted to send out a letter to all women in the university informing them of the assistance we could give them. We wanted to include a mailing of university faculty salaries (broken down on the basis of sex and departments). The administration held up the approval of the mailing labels until two days before the meeting was to occur. The Committee has offered to help with the development of the Affirmative Action Program. The administration has been hostile; our records were pulled in the personnel office to see if we (co-chairpersons) were 'trouble-makers.' A meeting was requested with the university president. We were told to phone back. A subsequent phone call indicated that the president was too busy 'right now.'"

Usually, a delaying tactic appears as a general statement of the president or chancellor who informs the public that sex discrimination is under study. Here is a typical newspaper announcement:

"The report was published this summer following a year's study by a seven-member faculty subcommittee appointed by the chancellor. A copy of the report was unavailable from him in mid-July although material from it was included in a series in this newspaper. He was reportedly studying it at that time. In a letter to academic deans, directors, and department heads following the report, he said, 'further interpretation is very much in order,' but added that 'it is of course essential that university policy and practice reflect equity and fairness in its relations with employee members of both sexes.' His letter also commented that the university should 'look far more intently than it has in the past to the womanpower pool, actual or potential, as a source for its greater strength and improvement.'"

Of course, uninvolved persons may not question the sincerity of the chancellor. But women with prior adverse experience of their own may interpret this statement as mere idealistic double talk designed to delay initiation of any concrete Affirmative Action Plan, let alone implement such a Plan.

It is important to note in the above excerpt that the chancellor's statement contained an attempt to create divisiveness between the sexes under the claim of equality and fairness. This is another tactic frequently reported as being used by administrators:

> "The strategy at my university is to tell every white male they don't hire that he wasn't hired because they had to hire a woman or a black. This response has been reported to me so many times that I think it has to be a strategy. It really works well in developing anti-feminist hostility toward both the feminists and women not yet feminist who are achievement oriented - otherwise knwon as 'pushy.' But 'they' can't really tell the difference - we all look alike!"

Divisive tactics also include other combinations of academicians besides men versus women and white men versus black men:

> "All the familiar divisive tactics have been used, including attempts to negotiate with individual women, rather than the committee, and efforts to pit women and minorities against each other."

Even trustees appear willing to engage in divisive tactics:

> "The trustees have rejected the idea of local Affirmative Action Officers (and apparently separate Affirmative Action Programs). Instead they are developing a response to pressures by recommending a central office - a further limit to the self-determination of women on each campus. One member of the Trustee Personnel Committee, a black, has flattered blacks at this college, but he is totally ill-informed and condescending regarding women. His insistence on the Central Office developing programs for the individual campuses has caused a difference of opinion among women and blacks here. The latter seem to think that this trustee is a fine supporter of Affirmative Action; the women do not."

One of the principle tenets of academic freedom is that academicians seek and teach the truth to the younger generation. But this norm does not seem to apply to some administrators:

> "The result on all of the women has been extreme discouragement, some retaliatory measures, and, more recently, downright lies from the administration! I've never caused any trouble on campus before, but I'ms suddenly some kind of ogre."

According to this respondent, misleading and deceitful statements are more or less a routine administrative counter stratagem.

Frequently, the reward system may be effectively used to manipulate the women or their supporters. Such tactics may serve to deny legitimate appeals for correcting inequities. For example, excuses such as nepotism rules and insinuations of incompetence often hide the real intentions of administrators:

"All requests to improve my professional situation met with evasions, frowns, put-downs, allegations (quite unjustified) of professional inferiority and nepotism. My husband was new and very junior in the department and was intimidated into not arguing my case very vigorously."

Intimidation may also thwart the work of a duly appointed committee for corrective action:

"Unfortunately, in our region HEW leaves much of its work to these women's commissions it has created on campus. If these women are successfully intimidated by the administration, nothing happens."

In sum, denial of sex discrimination, secrecy, double-talk, delaying tactics, manipulation of individuals and groups, divisiveness, outright deceit, and intimidation appear to be typical administrative tactics. These may become intermingled with other matters which have been raised such as inappropriate procedures for appealing a decision, how much weight to give to teaching, publications, and other criteria, and where the final responsibility lies for decisions affecting an academic woman's future.

4. Counter Moves by the Protestors.

What are some of the counter moves used by women as they attempt to seek and stabilize equal employment opportunities and conditions of work for themselves and for other women without resorting to appeals outside the "channels"?

Some counter stratagems are very specific and quite revealing:

"I think we would have been unsuccessful at overturning the nepotism rule if these rules had not been abandoned at nearby institutions at about the same time. Also helpful in overturning the rule were the concerted efforts of women in my department. Their strong feelings about my case were heard by a sympathetic department chairman."

However, when there are no women in a department to begin with, unlike this case, the pressure to hire a woman may be brought by women outside the department:

"I hear from the women on campus that there was quite a lot of pressure brought to bear on my department to fill this vacancy with a woman."

Here is an example where the members of an organized campus women's group have engaged in a range of activities in which they have made some inroads. Note that their serious pursuits even include an implied threat of filing a complaint or suit:

"Through our Association of Faculty Women, in particular, me, in the two cases which have been carried through to completion, we have used letters with documentation of the inequities and conferences with department chairman or dean, with the implied threat of filing a complaint or a suit. In one case we got an appropriate rank and salary, though temporary; in the other, we got tenure at the rank of lecturer in place of lecturer with a 3-year contract."

The results are sometimes favorable when there is a campus-wide coalition of sympathizers, as we saw earlier in the case of a professor who was denied tenure. But sometimes similar strategies fail:

"When my contract was not renewed, the students had demonstrations - this did not work. So people tried some of the 'street tactics,' which did not work."

Another specific employment issue is pregnancy, a condition which might supposedly interfere with a woman's professional performance. Here is how one respondent effectively resisted this discriminatory attitude:

"I was refused reassurance of reappointment as instructor when pregnant. I persisted and was reappointed. No woman in the department has since had the problem. Men now realize that women can be mothers and professors."

The single and most important weapon cited by the respondents is adverse publicity against the institution. Here is an example of one "deal" which a victim made with the president of her college:

"We made a deal. She assured me that I 'had nothing to worry about,' that is, she would overrule the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee. I promised her that I would not bring down any outside publicity on the college. In my initial appeal I had mentioned about twenty organizations who would support me publicly if I requested. I also had contacts with local papers and with people in other universities where they were writing articles on the firing of radical professors. In the case of my college, publicity and the threat thereof was important because the school is suffering a declining enrollment, partly because students feel the education is <u>not</u> relevant. It was bound to reflect badly on the college."

The following remarks of another respondent describes more amply the general effect of publicity for protesting women:

"Given the existence of Executive Orders and the various titles which can force compliance, I feel the single most important factor bringing about change is the existence of an organized group of women who have the power, mainly through access to the press or other publicity, to reveal inequities and thus both publicly embarrass institutions (which, being academic, must pride themselves on liberal humanism) or result in investigations by government authorities (also embarrassing) or in actual withdrawal of funds (always more a threat than a reality). Thus we have always sought and received good coverage of our activities and complaints in the student and city press, besides having our own newsletters and engaging in much correspondence."

Coalitions of women may also employ other courter stratagems to force reluctant administrations to correct inequities. Here is one such example in which the complaints of individuals are incorporated into a combination of approaches:

> "Our written documents - position papers and a 70-page affirmative program - formally made suggestions for change in most categories - hiring, promotions, salaries, sports, women's studies, etc. Extensive but inadequate corrections have been made in salary inequities, hiring goals for women, overdue promotions, clarification of dead-end ranks which mainly women are deposited in forever, examination of differences in financial support for women and men graduate students, beginning examination of gross inequities in classification of women in civil service positions.
>
> Individual complaints of women usually involve improper academic rank, with salary a secondary inequity. There have been many of these and have been handled through either official or unofficial channels. Women come to us sometimes first, or second after being either angered or humiliated by their encounter in the Chancellor's office. In the two cases which have been carried through to completion through our Association of Faculty Women, we have used letters with documentation of the inequities and conferences with department chairman or dean, with the implied threat of filing a complaint or a suit."

In this example, observe that organized group action, documentation, use of both formal and informal channels, and threats of filing a complaint or law suit all help to effectuate favorable results.

But, alas, the odds are overwhelmingly against the academic woman when she appeals for corrective action of her specific grievances through established channels. For frequently she finds no redress to her complaints; and the grievance process, which began as an appeal to correct inequities, quickly deteriorates into an adversary relationship. At this stage of the process the final sex discriminatory act may consist of benign neglect and inaction, tokenism and ostracism, a gradual and effective isolation of the "trouble maker," or even outright firing of tenured faculty women. Some of the protestors manage to find employment elsewhere. The majority of them, however, unable or unwilling to leave the campus or the area, fight back with appeals to activist women's groups, government agencies, and the courts. The stage of open confrontation has begun.

C. Confrontation

The response pattern of confrontation constitutes the culmination of the grievance process. This is identifiable in our study as appeals which go beyond the

campus boundaries or, more accurately, appeals which an academic woman makes outside the institutional channels for resolving grievances.

Almost without exception, the cases in the sample indicate that the respondents seek other help after they have failed to find any satisfaction from campus decisions or have reached an impasse with their departments or administrations. We have also seen that in many cases appeals through available grievance procedures are largely or entirely ignored:

> "Discrimination was apparent in salary, terms and conditions of work, harassment while on the job, and ultimate firing ('non-renewal') with no reasons ever given either orally or in writing. I went to the Faculty Personnel Committee and Deans, to AAUP (both university and national), to the American Civil Liberties Union, the state discrimination commission, to EEOC, and finally to a private lawyer."

The following quotation expresses more clearly why many academic women decide to go all the way, as did the above respondent:

> "Why am I going through all this even though I know I will never get a fair hearing and never get my job back? I don't even know myself. I think it is because I feel that I must do something because so many sisters do nothing - somehow I feel that I am doing this for more than me. If I don't do it, I will be letting others down. I feel that my sisters expect me to do something - to fight back, so I'm doing it. I also don't want the university administration to think that they can just do what the hell they want, and I really want to annoy them as much as possible. I know that they thrive on people being beaten into the ground and then just going away - the oppressor can always count on us falling under the yoke of our oppression - that is why it goes on for so long. And so I feel compelled to confront the oppressors. I know that I cannot win because for us to win means a long struggle and we must all be together; this action is only one moment in building the kind of unity we need if we are to ever win the struggle."

1. Appeals to women's groups, government agencies, and courts.

During the confrontation stage a woman may direct her apeals to an activist women's group on campus or to one or more women's groups or other organizations outside the campus boundaries. The more frequent course of action is to file complaints with government agencies. Finally, she hires lawyers and takes her case to court.

The typical response involves appeals to more than one agency, usually the regional Civil Rights Office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), and, to a lesser extent, the Wages and Hours Division of the Department of Labor and the Fair [illegible]

Employment Practices Commission (FEPC), state and local discrimination commissions, and other non-governmental groups and organizations:

> "In the spring of 1971 I was denied summer employment but all male professors got it; I was paid $400 per month less than the 11 male full professors in the school; I was denied a sabbatical modification granted to 28 males but to no females. I filed a sex discrimination complaint in April, first with the university's Affirmative Action Office and in May with OFCC."

The discriminatory act which forces women to appeal outside the organization may sometimes be an outright firing of a tenured faculty member. Appeals to several agencies is rather the norm, as the following response indicates:

> "I filed a complaint with the state civil rights commission and subsequently with the EEOC. Both of these agencies claimed that they are so swamped with cases two or three years old and were unable to do anything about my complaint. I contacted the HEW Civil Rights Office, the CEA, NEA, and the Labor Department Office of Contract Compliance. None of these agencies could or would assist me. In May I filed a suit in the U.S. District Court. So far I have met with nothing but failure. It is too early to predict the outcome of litigation."

Individuals may also press their complaints as a group. They may express concern for their own cases, for other faculty women, or even include the entire campus female population, including non-academic women:

> "The extent of discrimination became visible during a self-study conducted which coincided with an HEW complaint at two other universities in the state system. In June nine faculty members filed suit in Federal Court, charging discrimination against women in hiring, salaries, promotion, tenure, and assignments (but mostly salary).

The following response reveals how group action works:

> "We filed a complaint with HEW and EEOC based on data on salary and years at college obtained from a friendly Dean. The complaint was signed by <u>all</u> the <u>tenured</u> women. We have had to use continual pressure to bring these agencies to do their job, among which has been getting a senator to contact them in our behalf (several times). The University has an Affirmative Action Plan (full of sound and fury, signifying nothing), which we have blasted repeatedly to the local press. Publcity by the media has been one of our tools. Another is block voting at the faculty meetings at which committee members are elected. We find it essential to have strong tenured women on committees such as 'Appointments and Promotion' and 'Review' which hears grievances. We have now hired a lawyer to help us push our complaints and, if necessary, file suit in court."

Note that in the second case the protesting women have two advantages: they are less vulnerable as a group than as individuals, and they are all tenured faculty.

Finally, national organizations may get into action. Appeals are specifically

directed to organizations concerned with sex discrimination, some of which are also involved in other causes. Such appeals are usually in addition to other kinds of complaints made with federal or local agencies:

> "In the winter of 1972 we filed a class action complaint of sex discrimination with the State Commission Against Discrimination. In the spring of 1972 we prepared to file a sex discrimination complaint with HEW; however, at that time the college had no federal contracts...at the present time the school does have a sizeable federal contract and we are preparing a new complaint to file with HEW. In the spring of 1972 we also filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission...NOW and NAACP have decided to enter the complaint in our behalf...We also filed a complaint in 1972 with the Bureau of Labor, Division of Wages and Hours...In view of the long delays encountered dealing with agencies, many of us decided to secure a private lawyer to take our complaint to court. We now have a lawyer..."

The class action type of complaint in the above case is often filed by the national groups. Here is a case where a national women's organization files in behalf of a few women:

> "I was one of a very small group of women faculty (about 15% of faculty) who filed with HEW through WEAL about two years ago. We had been told that the school was to fire ten times more women than men to cut down expenses. I was the only one tenured and the school attempted to cut me back to 70 percent time. AAUP also was called in and exerted great pressure on my behalf. The others were dismissed."

As suggested in this case, AAUP's intervention usually involves tenure; it is also concerned with due process procedures:

> "I got some action from both the Washington office and the local chapter in drafting and sending a memorandum to the acting president that my grievance should be investigated with full due process. This was helpful but was as far as the AAUP was prepared to go; it is national AAUP policy not to get involved in sending out teams to investigate local grievances resulting from sex discrimination."

Finally, appeals are made to the women's committees and caucuses of the professional associations by women who refuse to leave any stones unturned as they await action from any number of sources:

> "I filed a formal personal complaint of sex discrimination with the American Physical Society (APS) Committee on the Status of Women in Physics. My complaint was presumably incorporated with others in a written, official report on sex discrimination issued by the APS. I understand that many copies of this report have been requested by academic institutions. I have noticed on my interview trips this year a dawning awareness of the plight of women, whether due to this report or other influences it's hard to say, but the impact so far has been much less than that required to get me the job I wanted."

2. With the Deliberate Speed of a Turtle.

It is one thing to appeal to agencies and courts and quite another to hear from them, let alone get any results. For after a complaint is filed with a government agency, there is a long and, to many protesting women, seemingly interminable waiting until there is a constructive response.

This is particularly true with HEW, as the following report indicates:

> "In July, 1971 I filed a personal complaint of sex discrimination with HEW against the university and the department. Six weeks later I received an acknowledgment that the complaint had been forwarded to the appropriate regional office, and that was the last I heard from HEW!"

Two years later when this response was received, the woman was still waiting. Even complaints filed by women's organizations seem to have the same fate:

> "Two years ago NOW filed a complaint with HEW against my college; no action whatsoever was ever taken on this complaint."

But long delays do not seem to be the exclusive characteristic of HEW, as the following comment indicates:

> "I was discriminated against on salary, promotion, and summer employment. I filed cases with HEW, EEOC, and FEPC. So far very little has happened. My cases have been filed with HEW and EEOC for over a year, but there has been no investigator here as yet. FEPC was here this past week so no decision has been reached."

Also, women have had similar experiences with state agencies where a two-year delay appears to be the norm:

> "When I found HEW had no jurisdiction at the school, I filed with the state Human Rights Commission. Now, two years later, the Commission is still trying to 'conciliate' by giving unlimited time to the school to dally, waiting for a Supreme Court decision, etc."

Neither are law suits less time-waiting:

> "The lawsuits, in which I am one of the plaintiffs, have been dragging on interminably."

Nevertheless, there are also rare occasions when a government agency acts. Here is one example where the Hours and Wages Division of the Department of Labor proves it can initiate an investigation with great speed. But we do not have any evidence that the final outcome of a complaint filed with this agency is as speedily reached:

> "The Faculty Women's Caucus collected questionnaire data from respondents throughout the university on discrimination in income, tenure, and promotion and went to the local Department of Labor office to file suit. A representative

from there walked into the personnel and payroll office and asked to see ALL faculty and staff files (without explaining why they had come, since they were legally entitled to do this). Our Deans consulted with the head of our Affirmative Action Office who told them that the women would certainly win the case involving back pay."

3. Open Warfare.

If stalling was an effective administrative tactic before the protesting woman took her problem to the nearest Office of Civil Rights, to some other agency, or to a lawyer or women's group, in open warfare stalling now becomes the administrator's forte. We have already seen how delays are achieved with an announcement to the newspapers stating good intentions but very little else or with an Affirmative Action Plan "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing," or even with the appointment of a token woman to head such a plan. Here is how one respondent describes the stalling act,

"No real successes or failures yet - just lots and lots of waiting and delays and abortive negotiations."

while another gives us a closer look at why delays may occur:

"The more sophisticated universities know how to stall HEW, which isn't too hard, and fool around with their affirmative action plans for months. Or they can stymie the women's commission that HEW has created on campus so that it accomplishes nothing. Unfortunately, in our region HEW leaves much of its own work to these women's commissions."

The same stalling tactic may be used against a court order in rather surprising fashion:

"The university has adamantly refused to make records available when ordered to do so by the court. Their strategy is apparently to delay until we lose heart and support."

Another administrator may go to even greater lengths in giving the appearance that something is being done although the move is, in fact, a stalling act:

"Some lip service, and perhaps some actual improvement in practice, has occurred with regard to recruiting new faculty. Several women have been hired, but mostly token appointments. A black woman has been appointed as Special Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs. She is supposed to be working (all year) on an Affirmative Action Plan, but nothing much has appeared to result from this so far."

It is possible that administrative stalling may derive from reliance on legalities rather than on substantive issues of equality, professionalism, academic standards, a

and good faith efforts to resolve grievances:

> "The administration of my school has been advised by the college attorney not to do anything about my case until HEW comes up with a finding. As it appears from the local regional office's performance thus far, there is never going to be a finding, and I am getting very tired of calling them up to remind them that I filed the complaint two years ago."

On those infrequent occasions when an investigation has taken place by a compliance agency, considerable time may also be consumed when the administrator finds it necessary to conduct a more complete study which will substantiate the findings of the agency:

> "A faculty committee was appointed by the president as a result of the HEW investigation. The group published a two-volume report on the status of women at the school and found rampant discrimination in all areas."

Although the president's actions in this case may be considered a necessary first ste- in affirmative action, it is interesting that not too much has happened for women in that school since the lengthy report was issued, despite the committee's findings.

To what extent administrators and compliance agencies are reinforcing each other's stalling tactics is not easily apparent to the respondents. Frequently, this may not be the situation at all. For we are keenly aware that most college and university administrations resent government intrusion (but not government money) into the "affairs of the university" where freedom of thought must not be corrupted by political or other considerations. One way to maintain the autonomous nature of academic institutions (besides weakening the complainant's case) is to declare <u>publicly</u> for the benefit of the government's investigating team that sex discrimination does not exist at all, never did exist, and never will exist on that campus. We have already seen how this tactic is used privately to discourage protesting women by denying the existence of salary discrepancies ("oversights") between men and women faculty. Here is how a campus newspaper reports the opening session of hearings for two women in whose behalf the government agency was charging the college for sex discrimination:

> "The college has 'formally denied any discrimination' according to the attorney who is representing the college in the commission hearings. In an interview he stated: 'We say we do not have any discrimination at ___ in

> hiring, employment, promotion, or tenure with respect to race, color, creed, national origin, sex or age. 'We insist,' he continued, 'that we have not discriminated against any employee, man or woman, because of sex.'"

With such a statement it should take a little longer to establish whether or not there is even "cause" for the complaint. The decision in the case is still pending several months after the hearings ended. In the meantime, the academic community and the public at large are supposed to accept ipso facto the lawyer's "operation candor."

Yet our respondents also indicate that it may be more effective strategy, despite the necessity to remain aloof from contaminating forces, for administrators to join hands with the compliance agencies:

> "HEW just backed up the administration."

We have also seen that some of the protesting women imply or openly state the existence of accommodating delays by government agencies, especially HEW; and at least one of our respondents is able to show some proof of collusion between the HEW regional office with a university administration:

> "I also met with a group of women from the nearby university who were very angry that the field compliance officer (black, male) who had investigated their complaints, filed earlier, had apparently sold out to the university. Unable to get relief from HEW, they took their case to court straight away and were thereby able to subpoena the HEW report on their cases which had hitherto remained confidential. I read the report and it amply confirmed their contention."

It would be nearly impossible to ascertain how widespread such outright collusion is. Collusion, however, may manifest itself in many forms such as unreasonable footdragging, partial resolutions of cases, negative findings which show complete disregard for the submitted evidence, threatening but not actually withdrawing federal funds, and failing to establish and demand rigorous and faithful implementation of affirmative action plans within stated time periods. Otherwise, one is hard pressed to explain the hard-line strategy displayed by some college or university executives. Their ultimate weapon would have to be some sort of accommodation or outright collusion with some of the agencies who are supposed to protect the complainant's professional and civil rights rather than reinforce the arguments of the defending institution.

To this date, HEW has yet to withhold funds from any educational institution. Here is one respondent's statement which summarizes the observations of many others;

"At the moment the university is still negotiating with HEW but their funds funds have not been suspended."

while HEW's dilly-dallying is more amply recognized with a pessimistic note by another respondent:

"HEW is stalling in going to sanction hearings. They have not taken one single case to hearings since Executive Order 11375 became effective in 1968. I thought my case would set up a precedent. The fight is not worth it for my case alone if no precedent is set up.

Finally, administrators can also stall by relying on others besides government agencies. Such partners may be the protesting woman's own colleagues:

"According to the Human Rights Commission, this case would probably affect every college woman faculty member in the state, and therefore the department doesn't want to rush the school 'since it would be very expensive.'"

Or it may be that the delays are caused by some internal institutional problem of such magnitude that sex discrimination may have to take a back seat. Here is a case explaining the cause of the delay in which three women established a local WEAL chapter and filed a complaint against a large state university:

"The university is still dragging its feet in formulation of an affirmative action plan - in part a women's issue, but also part of a larger problem of exclusion of all faculty from policy decisions throughout the university. There has been some improved awareness among some faculty but very little headway with department heads.

At this point one may wonder: could all this take place in academia? Yes, and much more. Abuse of power by administrators does not restrict itself to violating basic civil rights; it is also reflected in non-conformity to norms of appropriate and responsible standards of conduct entrusted in academic administration. Such abuses may range from a mild action of deliberately failing to attempt conciliation,

"Three faculty filed a charge with EEOC. Efforts by EEOC to conciliate failed so we are now planning to file a suit against the university. We have obtained the right to sue a state institution from the justice department."

to wasteful spending of tuition and tax money:

"They have been unbelievably arrogant to our attorney and have spent a fortune in taxpayers' money on legal fees, much more than it would have cost to settle our suit:"

In a letter to the university's chancellor, a women's group which included graduate

students writes,

> "...an implicit - and often explicit - attitude seems to be prevalent among male faculty members: now that the Department counts three women on its faculty (after years of ceaseless efforts by our caucus) the 'pressure is off.' In other words, the University guidelines on Affirmative Action can now be safely disregarded."

The plot thickens when administrators handle individual grievances and begin changing the rules. One of the excuses for denying correction of inequities runs like the "tails I win, heads you lose" argument:

> "I have taught for ten years, have had a post-doctoral, and have published ten papers (and presented another ten) and have won a commendation for excellence in teaching (both from the Honors students and the AKD). Yet, I still remain untenured. Each year another reason is presented. Last year the reason was, 'You haven't taught here long enough and the visiting year doesn't count.' On the previous go-around the reason was, 'You are married and have a house in this city and aren't going anywhere; there is no urgency in your case.' A third reason is that my publication record is 'not superior': since I have been 'out' for a long time, my record should be 'greater.' Another reason given to me is a double-whammy (you can't win). I am, says the Dean, not 'integrated into the department' and 'two of your papers are joint with your departmental colleagues: how do I know you did the work?' Either way, the rules seem to change and I lose."

And, unlike the remarks of another respondent indicated earlier, playing the game submissively may get you nowhere:

> "I played it quietly, without trying to push, for four years. That produced no results. In the past year and a half I have been aggressive about trying to get a fair settlement, and the result is that those who are opposed to my appointment say, 'We don't want such an aggressive woman on the staff.' So you can't win either way. I filed a complaint with HEW more than a year ago; the university's reaction was that this action showed my bad character."

But, in addition to showing "bad character," filing a complaint is considered to be unladylike:

> "I filed the first sex-discrimination complaint against the university! Not only does a LADY not do such things, including NOW members, but my having filed the first case with EEOC is especially unforgiveable."

Secrecy also takes on different forms when complaints or law suits are pending than when the protesting woman first presents her complaints to her department chairperson. In the following example the hopeful complainant, waiting for the government agency to act, fails to realize that it may be more to the administration's advantage than to hers not to publicize her case:

> "Because I am still fighting to be reinstated, it is better to be silent; it is a counterstrategy in itself when to put pressure and when to wait."

The above respondent might change her mind about the virtues of remaining silent were she to hear some of the administrative arguments for observing secrecy. One president was reported in a student newspaper as saying,

> "You'd do more damage to people by free and open discussion, even if a person asks for it."

Character assassination as an administrative "dirty trick" designed to drive "trouble makers" off the campus appears to be actively pursued by many administrators. Here the stereotypes of women hold full sway:

> "I have been entrapped, bugged, taped, quoted, and so forth. One example is of a student from the campus newspaper supposedly interviewing me who tried to get me to say that I'd been giving abortion counseling. My boss is 'pressing' now - has resorted to the ultimate 'zones': mental health and sexuality. The results on me are that I am unemployable."

The intimidation and harassment against women who file complaints may sometimes reach unbelievable proportions:

> "Last year I filed in federal court against the department for sex discrimination. You will not believe the personal degradation I have suffered since filing, using Title VII and the first and fourteenth amendments. The University is trying to locate every illegal act I have ever committed, but fortunately, with the exception of two minor traffic violations, I am 'clean.' I have been labeled a troublemaker, a firebrand, and emotionally unstable."

The above respondent had also presented a paper at a professional conference which led to the formation of a commission on the status of women in her state but which, according to her, brought her only "personal harassment." Here is an excerpt from a campus newspaper referring to a tenured professor who had been subjected to constant threats of firing by her administration:

> "Though she has asked repeatedly for reasons for such harassment, President ___ has alluded only to 'secret documents' holding defamatory material so secret that even she is not allowed to know their contents. She believes that the real reason for the administration's repeated attempts at firing is her active involvement in women's causes...The last attempt followed her filing a complaint with HEW."

When cases actually reach the point of scheduling a hearing the entire resources of the campus seem to be deployed in order to drive the "enemy" from the campus. How the reward system is geared to accomplish this is vividly portrayed by one woman:

> "After six days of hearings and some outlandish 'hate' witnesses which the judge removed from the witness stand or had the federal marshal remove from the courtroom (because of disturbances), I received a court injunction. There

was lots of perjury on the witness stand. The Dean under cross examination essentially admitted his twisted story. Students who had previously supported me but who now work for my chairman, perjured themselves, too. Faculty who had written very favorable letters about my teaching ability refused to say so under oath for fear of being fired. I am back to work now but I cannot answer my phone because of the obscene phone calls."

Demands for a f .r hearing for a protesting woman may end up with the administration setting up a kangaroo court,

"There were lots of lies, letters backdated by one month from the administration, etc. After 3,000 students, staff, and faculty signed a petition for a fair hearing, a kangaroo court hearing was offered, which I did not accept."

and with the complaint ending in court. In some "duly" established hearings even the top administrator of the school testifies, leading the drive on distortions, retroactive change of rules to fit the alleged "crime," outright deceitful statements, and false witnesses to discredit the "trouble maker" professionally and otherwise.

4. The Field After the Battle.

What are the results of confrontation?

At some point during the confrontation stage some administrators may decide to take the line of least resistance. They make some gesture to resolve the issues, or at least some of the issues. Here we are primarily concerned with the outcome of cases, regardless of whether or not the compliance agency or court of law has made a final determination or "disposition."

Monetary compensation seems to be the most frequent type of "adjustment" for resolving grievances. But such compensation may not even begin t se the inequities which protesting women have listed and documented as sex-related grievances. Those women who have gone through all the grievance stages almost without exception view the end results in less than satisfactory terms:

"I have once again failed to receive summer employment. Men with my qualifications have been promoted, but no woman has been promoted on our campus to my knowledge. There have been some slight nods in our direction with an insulting $15 a month adjustment, which is about 1/10th the amount I feel I deserve."

Furthermore, as the above quotation shows, women who file the complaints do not

appear to fare any better than those who don't; in fact, their complaints may be completely ignored beyond the token salary increases given to all the women:

> "Many women were given raises above the 5.5% standard increases everyone was given. We were also given raises (the chargees) but no poromotions, tenure, back pay, etc."

When pressure is brought by a compliance agency, under the adverse and potentially embarrassing publicity a university administration may recognize the demands of women and make a first move in the direction of compliance. However, even here the adjustment may be for one year only and does not necessarily indicate any bona fide attempts to remove inequities for all the campus women for all time. In the following rare example where a compliance office has shown signs of life, going so far as to exert some pressure, many women are still hard at work:

> "My salary for 1972 was $11,450 for 9 months. The average salary for associate professor was $13,600. I was given a $1,750 raise for 1973 as a result of our investigations and the pressure brought by HEW. This also has encouraged the hiring of a few women faculty at our institution. We are still hard at work through our local Committee of Women on Campus, AAUP Committee W, Sociologists for Women in Society, and the state Commission of the Status of Women to improve hiring practices, salaries, tenure and promotion for faculty women, staff, professional staff women, and women students."

In another rare case where a compliance agency rendered a final judgment - and a positive one at that - the lump-sum settlement following years of blatant discrimination throughout the entire career of a full professor does not even begin to restore the losses:

> "So far I have had the offer of reinstatement and $47,000. But this does not cover remedies for my complaints of past discrimination."

And actually being involved in a law suit by one group of women was felt to constitute some degree of progress, especially in view of the fact that a more permanent base was established for the redistribution of power within the institution:

> "The women involved in the law suit have thus far received substantial raises, two were promoted, two were granted tenure, and several of us have found ourselves on important university committees where formerly no women or only 'safe' women would be found. So I would say that the protection of having a suit in litigation in a federal court has been quite substantial, and that our position is better than that of most women who have relied upon complaints to administrators to redress their grievances."

However, it is important to note that, as in the previous two cases, that these "good faith" efforts on the part of the administrators to reduce sex inequities do

not indicate a planned effort through affirmative action to change the future status of the women. In short, the accommodation does not involve the necessary institutional re-arrangements. We can also wonder how the university committees were constituted in the last case.

Often complaints and a combination of other circumstances on campus may provoke an arbitrary selective process as to who profits from the token efforts of the administrators to correct inequities. In this respect they may be quite inconsistent in the distribution of the rewards to women. For while some women may gain, others may lose. In the following example both older women and medical students are the losers following the filing of a complaint,

> "Success has been obtained in some very subtle ways. The univesity has promoted one of the younger women to full professor as a token. The older women are still overlooked. This same person was appointed head of a women's equality committee: she was to look into encouraging women medical students, which amounts to nothing."

while in another case the losers are part-time women not on the "tenure track":

> "The part-time women filing the complaint with HEW lost but women in the 'regular' positions won."

One explanation for the seemingly unfair results of token compliance which may exacerbate discrimination rather than eliminate it is that some administrators do not pay any heed to existing Affirmative Action guidelines which would make it possible to have a clear policy for equalizing work conditions. This is suggested in all our cases, if not outrightly stated. Here is one respondent who indicates that Affirmative Action Plans may be more a dream than a reality:

> "Those few women who had 'regular' positions were given a raise in salry to bring their pay up to par with men faculty, but the university has, naturally, fewer women teaching this year than last year. Their Affirmative Action Plan to hire more women has not brought significant numbers of women to campus."

More significant than the token or less-than-satisfactory resolutions to sex-discriminatory complaints are the results when administrators decide to take a hard-line approach. Our respondents indicate that this is by far the most commonly used strategy on their campuses. There are several ways in which it occurs. One way is to completley ignore the woman who has filed the complaint while rewarding other

women:

> "There has been no action in my case. A few minimal results for other women on the faculty - appointment to committees (all very weak at this college), one appointed professor (we now have two)."

Often such rewards go to women who are non-feminists:

> "A latent outcome of my activities on the behalf of women in my department has been the increase in salary for one woman and the promotion of one associate professor to full professor. Ironically (although predictably), both of these women are 'against women's liberation.' I have mixed feelings about these latent consequences. I am happy that their injustices have been righted and yet angry that it has been my activity which has brought this to fruition and I receive none of the benefits."

Another way is to engage in one form or another of reprisal against one or all the women who file complaints against their institutions. Harassment and intimidation are two such expressions which administrators use to even up the score. One respondent tells how such harassment occurred in the case of another protestor:

> "One of the two other women at my university who filed with EEOC after I did had reprisal against her in the form of destruction of her files or papers which were in her office."

Still another indicates that husbands of protestors may be the unfortunate objects of reprisal,

> "There has been a considerable sense of intimidation: two unexplained episodes of removal of husbands from responsible positions. Their wives were known as troublemakers."

while another reports that in her university the entire femal faculty were being punished:

> "So far, no success. We are hoping the agencies will come through for us. Since we wrote our initial report and filed the complaints, the salary gap between men and women faculty has widened."

The ultimate form of retaliation comes when the protestor is herself fired. In fact, firing seems to be a rather common consequence for academic women who challenge their employers. Here is a case where the administration made a clean sweep:

> "All the feminists in my university have been fired."

Being fired is also the fate, perhaps not unexpectedly, for part-time workers who lack the advantages which fully employed academic women have in colleague support and access to legal redress:

"I was one of several women who filed a complaint with HEW. I was never called to teach again. Most of the women who were associated with the complaint were not called to teach again because their circumstances were the same as mine. HEW could not 'protect' me because their guidelines do not cover 'part-time workers.'"

It is especially important to note that such a disastrous course of action as being fired may occur despite overwhelming support for opposite action, as this case of highly recommended professor shows:

"I am the first woman in my state to win a case with the Human Rights Commission on the basis of sex discrimination in higher education. I believe I may be one of the first to achieve both reinstatement and promotion - not just rehiring. My promotion was recommended by a department committee, the chairman, and dean. I had top priority in the department, number 2 priority in the School of Liberal Arts (17 departments). The president turned down the promotion, arbitrarily. I then filed with the state Commission. The president fired me, giving no reasons that were of substance. It took hundreds of days to claw my way out of the snakepit."

And it is also important to note that filing a law suit may make it possible for a group of women to hold the line against retaliatory measures and even gain support from unexpected quarters:

"So far the women involved as plaintiffs have not been retaliated against. Subtle pressures have been applied in some cases, but we have been able to resist them successfully so far. And although I am sure my male colleagues are outraged and critical, some have been quite supportive since the lawsuit was filed over a year ago."

The selective process as to who among the protestors goes and who stays does not end with the type of employment or even one's proclivity to feminism. Retaliatory screening occasionally finds some protesting women winners, others losers, even when they have filed a complaint together or were otherwise equally involved in protest activities. In one case where three women grouped together as complainants, two made substantial progress for both themselves and other women, while the third found herself blackballed and even deeper in protest activities in her ostracized condtion:

"With two other women we established a local WEAL chapter and lodged a complaint under Executive Order 11246 through WEAL with the Department of HEW. Most women have received pay raises though not yet completely equal to men, and there have been some promotions for some women. Of the three original women, two of us have been promoted. The third has been blackballed and now has a harassment complaint lodged with HEW and EEOC.

In another case, mentioned earlier, where an active women's caucus had succeeded in

bringing a Department of Labor investigator, one of the protestors suddenly vanished from sight, while some gains were made for others left behind:

> "The group strategy was very effective, except that at least one of the women involved is no longer at the university. Senior women in particular have benefitted from the strategy."

In the last two examples it may seem ironic to punish only one of the protestors who help turn the tide for other non-protesting women. It may even seem outrightly cruel. Certainly the following words of one such casualty suggest an element of cruelty:

> "Three years ago I filed a federal contract compliance complaint against the University. Much has changed for other women as the result of this action, but I am unemployed."

But only cruelty can describe the outcome for the protesting woman when she finds that the only sin she committed - filing a complaint with a government agency - may follow her all the days of her life as she tries vainly to resurrect her ruined career. One full professor writes of the unenviable state of being blacklisted for a position after she had been fired following filing a complaint as the first woman on her campus:

> "I heard from the university that I was not on the final slate. Shortly thereafter I received a letter from a recent alumna of the school informing me I'd 'made' it right down to the last four (which included 1 black and 2 women) but that members of the committee had told her that my references said I was 'devisive' AND I HAD FILED A SEX DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINT AGAINST ANOTHER STATE UNIVERSITY!"

Confrontation is the last stage in the grievance process. During this protracted period of time protesting avademic women face the full impact of power and resources available to college and university administrations. The net results are only temporarily accommodating solutions designed to hush up the complainants and maintain the <u>status quo</u>. The compliance agencies also miss the point: even in those rare cases where a determination has been reached, any positive results are almost entirely limited to monetary gains, and minimal at that. Past discrimination does not count, and next year's problems can be postponed; affirmative action is frequently but an empty phrase. But whatever the outcome, the results stop short of establishing the necessary institutional framework to cope with a universal problem.

Nearly all our cases seem to show, in one way or another, unplanned, vacillating, and unfair policies and procedures in coping with sex discrimination.

Additionally, throughout our survey we have so far been able to see how administrative action, sometimes approaching vindictiveness, asserts itself. Now we can see two after-effects with probably far-reaching implications: one is punishment of the protestor while rewarding those who do not protest; and the other is ruining the protestor's career, perhaps for all time. In this respect academic women who decide to protest sex-related inequities through legal action are likely to become both the sacrificial lambs and the victims. Some women give up altogether. Others find outlets outside their campuses for their feminist convictions and their desire to make wrong right. What protesting women do beyond the ivy-covered walls of academia becomes our fourth type of response pattern.

D. Activism Outside Academia

Unlike the first three response patterns, the fourth does not take place on the campus or in relation to the protesting woman's own case. Also, it does not involve making complaints or confronting the administration with law suits. Protesting academic women also appear to be active in other activities of various types relative to the women's movement, sometimes in relation to academic discrimination, sometimes not. Women are engaged in a round of activities whose common theme is that they are discriminated against, not only in academia, but in society:

> "I filed cases with EEOC, HEW, and FEPC. I worked through and on our university's Status of Women Committee, I testified in state capitol before the state Commission on the Status of Women, I discussed my problems with the Affirmative Action Officer, my superiors, and public officials. I worked for passage of the ERA. I attempted to get appointments on more university committees which would demonstrate my willingness, capabilities, and interests."

Some employed women prefer to put their efforts in activities outside their campuses because of the risks entailed in questioning administrative decisions and out of a feeling that protest would be hopeless. For such women these efforts to contribute to the women's movement are both diversionary and compensatory, although they may also involve risks of another kind. Here is an example of one woman who

was able to displace her anger and frustration at the same time that she found a market for her talents:

> "Looking back, I see that I did not pursue the available legal remedies at all vigorously. At first I wondered why, since I am a fairly "confrontation oriented" person. I, who am so ready to "fight" really did not have the guts to tolerate what I, deep inside, knew would happen. Then, having attended the hearings of _____'s case, I believed I couldn't win. The university turned out all its big guns to try and show that she was incompetent. I knew that if I had filed a complaint, my employer would testify that I was "abrasive," "hard to work with," and suspected that there would also be an attack on my competence as well. What I did was throw myself wholeheartedly into a <u>different</u> struggle - that of creating a business with no money and no credit. Because of the growth of the women's movement and some fortunate decisions, it is succeeding and growing far beyond my hopes and expectations. My unthought out strategy, then, was to retreat on the academic front and fight the enemy by helping to organize dissent and rebellion in another way. I have also been very active in NOW, both locally and nationally."

As this respondent suggests, academic women who have been involved in countering sex discrimination on their own campuses appear to be very active members of national women's organizations such as NOW and WEAL, often in leadership positions. In such strategic positions they may even be able to attack the problem of sex discrimination more effectively, and especially come to the rescue of other women needing help:

> "As the President of my state's division of Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), I help women on campuses file charges for sex discrimination against their universities. WEAL usually files a class action charge in our name to protect the individual woman. It's exciting to see women who have been kept down for decades on our campuses finally draw the line and start fighting back."

Academic women who protest sex inequities on their own campuses have also been at the forefront of the women's movement in their professional associations, helping to organize caucuses and the other <u>ad hoc</u> and advisory women's groups to promote change in their profession and in their departments. One woman who had written a paper for distribution to the governing body (Council) of her professional association says the following about her efforts as a member of the women's caucus:

> "Members of the newly formed Association for Women Psychologists (AWP) had observed that when male psychologists participated in rap sessions in which women revealed the details of their experiences in graduate school and in job-seeking and their pain, they often experienced a radical change in their perspective. So a call went out for papers on the subject in the hope that Council members might be moved to be more sympathetic with the requests that the AWP was making for improvement in our status."

Often these women's groups come to the direct aid of their colleagues who seek help,

but more often our protesting women find membership to be sufficiently rewarding in itself:

> "My increasing interest in Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) is a strategy purely for self-confidence and knowledge. It works like a consciousness-raising cell."

Perhaps as significant as leadership and membership in the professional associations are the many endeavors by individual women and also by coalitions of women in activities which cross academic disciplines and promise change in both direct and indirect ways. Although many examples may be cited here, the following should suffice to illustrate the extent to which many of our respondents, who have themselves experienced discrimination, will go to eliminate inequities for other women:

> "I spent July preparing to testify, and testifying, on H.R. 208, the Mink Educational Equity bill."

Here are the words of yet another woman testifying before a congressional committee for tax reform:

> "We ask to have the tax-free status of the universities and foundations re-examined and suspended until such time as they make some realistic and fundamental changes and become the open and equal institutions they were meant to be...Specifically, we ask that the same clauses that apply to public moneys should apply to foundation funds so they cannot be used where discrimination exists."

Another respondent tells of her experience organizing a coalition of women's organizations in order to get women, many of whom are in academia, to sit on the scientific advisory panels of the many government granting offices from which women have been virtually excluded in the past:

> "Initially unsuccessful approaches to NASA and the National Academy of Sciences made it clear, however, that action to rectify the virtual exclusion of women could not and should not be taken by any one person or one organization. What we needed was a coalition of women's groups including not only scientists, but lawyers and the lay public. To accomplish this I put on my several caps...and organized a small, loosely knit group of women from several professional organizations. The group grew stronger and larger, however, as the men resisted our efforts...I polled my 70 members, receiving an unequivocal go-ahead from them, also. Finally, the group determined to be effective in increasing the number of women in advisory and decision-making roles in a granting agency."

Another type of important activity in which protesting women engage is directly related to the academic profession - scholarship through research and publications.

The intent is to expand the knowledge about all women, not merely academicians; and to expose the myths, inaccuracies, and sex discriminatory practices which take place in all segments of the society. Participation in such intellectual activities may or may not help advance academic careers. Here is a case of one woman who had yet to hear about the outcome of her hearing review in one college but who was preparing to put her scholarly knowledge to good use even before she had begun her new position:

> "I'm expected to go back to being a scholar and stop fooling around with all this women's stuff. I'll be very interested in the reaction of my professional colleagues to my next line of research, which has to do with the perception of women in the Middle Ages, and which takes a highly revisionist approach to the whole courtly business. I must say, fighting this discrimination thing certainly keeps one on one's toes - or dead."

In sum, activism outside the campus boundaries by academic women may become a way of life sooner or later for academic women who have challenged the status quo. Many of our respondents are involved in no one, but several other activities related to the women's movement. Three points should be made about these activities: First, it is easier, and sometimes even more productive, to work outside than inside the system, especially where there is strong institutional resistance to change; as a matter of fact, administrators with questionable or negative performances on matters related to sex discrimination on their campuses may welcome outside activities as a cover-up for their administrative malpractices. Second, academic training and intellectual abilities are great assets in working for the women's movement and give support, at least in part, to the maxim that "the pen is sometimes mightier than the sword"; and, third, campus protest is part of a larger revolutionary movement which goes beyond the bounds of professional interests and employment status.

III. THE EFFECTS OF PROTEST

What is the impact of the protest experience on academic women and their institutions? What happens to the self images and the careers of these women? What changes occur because of their attempts to correct employment inequities?

At most, these are complex and difficult questions to answer here. As yet most of our respondents who had filed complaints had yet to reach any terminal outcome of their cases. We can only present the impact of their experiences at the present stage in which they found themselves when responding to the questionnaire. And we can only offer their own interpretations of the experience on their institutions, keeping in mind the limiations of such responses.

A. Impact on the Individual

At one time or another, most of our respondents experience a strong degree of anger as they fight sex discrimination in academia, and they keep their anger to themselves:

> "Let me try to describe my reaction when it was clear that the university wasn't going to make me an offer. I was on the job market at the time and felt that the people they were looking at were way 'inferior' to me, and that they simply didn't want to hire a woman and certainly not a feminist, and that they were therefore downgrading my abilities. My reaction was to just withdraw from everything - wouldn't talk to anyone, avoided the office, tried to sneak in and out when no one would be around. I had so much anger and was so hurt that I just couldn't deal with it all."

This also includes the frustrating experience of seeing that a few women do the work for those unwilling to get involved,

> "I have been frustrated at the non-involvement of other women who let a few do the work for them, at my own and the Committee's lack of know-how about working within the university system, at our lack of actual power as a committee, and at the tendency to let the have-nots (non-tenured faculty) carry the burden of discrimination."

and which may end in disappointment:

> "Trying to make it in the system...is the way to self-destruction."

But often mixed with anger and frustration are other combinations of feelings, such as resentment, bitterness, isolation, rejection, discouragement, self-blame, and fear. The following remarks illustrate all of these feelings, and others besides:

> "I guess I have been a very slow learner, trusting somehow in the justice (eventually) of the system and for myself. But this year I am consumed with anger and indignation. I feel as though I've been had for these past years and now with the job market tight, my real responsibilities for my children, and the view from below as I watch my once-upon-a-time peers advance through the ranks (even my students are associate professors already), I am resentful

and bitter. Some of this bitterness, of course, turns inward: I should have been better, I should have looked out for myself. All the knowledge we pass onto students, including our understanding of the politics of organizations, I could not activate in terms of my own career. I have this nagging self-doubt that maybe I really am not capable and who the hell-do-I-think-I-am playing at professor? I don't have the basic self-confidence that I am hireable, capable, competent, etc., and going through the process of job-finding encourages all these fears."

A more specific situation of an already employed woman indicates the costs of sex discrimination for both the protestor and the entire department, including the students:

"The result on the department has been complete fragmentation with almost no communication across 'sides.' The chairman feels a great deal of pressure from my professional community to appoint me, because I am well qualified, and his reaction to that has been to harass me in every possible way. The students requested that I be allowed to teach a certain graduate course, and his answer was 'over my dead body,' so that the ill feeling even takes its toll down to the student level. I have become totally bitter about the whole thing and will probably leave the university, even if I win the case."

And the human cost can be substantial:

"The real question of all this is cost, not only the cost of a lawyer or threat of a job, but also cost in an unbelievable amount of human energy. Between all this nonsense I am trying to write. I have some ideas outlined and when 'free' (from the appeal, from the haggling, etc.), do write. But there is a fury in me that so much intelligence on both sides and humaneness is squashed in the process of continual discrimination."

The result of involvement in change may sometimes be drastic:

"I shall probably never be the same in my outlook on life. I never knew people could be so treacherous. Possibly this is so out of a real fear of being fired."

Perhaps even more serious than the effects on the personalities, physical and mental strength, and the morale of the responding women is the impact which the experience has on their careers, both actual and perceived. Earlier we saw how engagement in open confrontation often reached the point of administrative reprisal in blackballing, firing, and blacklisting women who had filed complaints. In some cases the damage appears to be severe and irreparable. One woman summarizes succinctly the impact of her involvement on her career:

" I was slaughtered as a scientist!"

Another speaks for all protestors:

"There must be some way to prevent other women from the destruction of their professional careers when they fight illegal sex discrimination!"

But even women who file complaints after being fired find that their careers have been seriously affected. The unemployed woman may reach the point of desperation, especially when she has children to support:

"I must feed and house myself and my children. How can I do that without switching out of academia? I am untouchable from the point of view of academia notwithstanding my three degrees from Harvard."

And the woman fortunate enough to have found another job while waiting for a judgment on her case finds her career moving in a regressive direction:

"I have experienced difficulty in finding a new position because of my activities, although I finally have found one at a lower salary and a lower position within my grade than I enjoyed before."

In a few cases the impact of the protesting experience may have negative consequences for future feminist activism. A pledge to conform is one outcome:

"Should I obtain another job, I plan to conform and 'take it.' I badly need the money, because selling blood just does not pay my expenses, and I cannot get my unemployment check until late July."

Another result is hesitancy to speak out because of fear of being blacklisted while searching for another job:

"Were I to declare that I know for a fact that I have been blacklisted in my field would be extremely risky. In fact, I am not going to really complete this form. Too bad, the system goes against us even as we try to work our way out of it."

And, finally, the treatment received by one respondent who protested sex inequities has negative consequences for the institution itself,

"What I have been doing was the activity of the typically alienated. I have withdrawn from the department and am taking what I can from it. I fulfill all requests asked of me but I have not forged ahead on my own creating new courses, new programs for honors students, etc."

and especially for the students, as both this and the following case shows:

"My case has aroused a surprising amount of really vicous resentment in a sizeable number of my male undergraduate students, especially those in lower-division courses. They apparently feel very threatened by a woman who stands up for her rights! This has made some unexpected difficulty in relating to certain classes in the way a good teacher should, a difficulty which I had not experienced before."

The effect on the protesting woman is not always negative or destructive. In fact, even the most difficult and painful experiences, regardless of whether or not

the outcomes are successful, motivate most academic women protesting sex inequities to move in other directions:

> "I was told I couldn't be considered for a job in charge of an inpatient unit because that job wouldn't be given to a woman with young children. The result was that I was furious, depressed for months. I didn't say anything at the time, but the experience radicalized me, resulting in my actively agitating for, and getting membership on the American Psychiatric Association Task Force on Women."

As this situation illustrates, these efforts may be aimed outside the campus. But they also occur on the respondent's own campus:

> "For me it is not the open hositility, or bad jokes, or any of the overt behavior but rather the indirect and subtle behavior which is the more difficult and frustrating to deal with. The 'enemy' does not attack but rather ignores my existence. Memos pass from one level of administration to another without even stopping at my desk. Meetings are held which affect my program and I'm not even invited to attend. Experience has taught me that responding to each incident only wears me out and seems to have little or no impact on the institution. My counter stratagems, as they continue to develop, are therefore as subtle as the initial discrimination. Chief among these strategies is building a female counter network. This is by no means an easy task since many women feel insecure in their positions and uncomfortable about helping another woman. Once a trust base can be established these relationships can be mutually beneficial."

Certainly, the effect on all our respondents has been to raise their consciousness levels to points far beyond what they had been when they first became aware of sex discrimination against themselves or others:

> "The experience was exhausting, but also exhilirating and consciousness-raising, both for me and for those who struggled with me."

Such feelings are also usually accompanied by an awakening concerning the realities of life and confidence in one's own strengths,

> "I feel that my political naivete is gone forever. I have been verbally abused and attempts are constantly made to dismiss the issue - and me - but I feel more self-respect than I've ever felt. I believe in my intelligence, abilities, and values and will continue to struggle for them."

appreciation of the concept of sisterhood,

> "For me personally, the most important positive result was learning the importance of sisterhood, not just because of the sense of warm support it brings but the real power. I had always assumed, and been encouraged to assume, that academic politics was something the men did, and women were rewarded for their meritorious performances and for 'being nice.' My sisters, faculty and students alike, made it possible for me to weather the psychic shock of discovering that the sky didn't fall when you kicked back hard, if you were kicked. Anger alone would never have been sufficient for me personally to have survived this whole process."

and involvement in a purpose:

> "The experience of working on the University Committee has had several effects on me: a feeling of involvement and purpose."

Without question, the experience of protesting sex inequities has a strong impact on academic women with serious implications for their academic performances and their professional careers. Nonconformity to the norms of academic and female obedience indicate that temporarily, if not permanently, the intellectual talents of these highly educated women are diverted from the task at hand and wasted in the daily round of fighting discrimination. It is equally evident that personal experience is also a highly radicalizing one. Even those women who are at first unaware of what might be involved when theychallenge authority acquire a deeper understanding of the values embodied in the women's movement.

B. Effects on the Institution

The overwhelming consensus of our respondents is that if any gains were made at all, they were far too inconsequential to bring about discernible changes on campus concerning the status of women. One respondent, expressing such consensus, states,

> "My impresssion of the whole effort, locally and nationally, is that there is lots of noise from every segment and very little action."

and another says,

> "The only change in the institution is that the men are beginning to 'talk" a better story. But there has been very little action.'"

Another variation is that one individual's case is not enough to compel change,

> "The committees created because of my case still exist and operate, but they do not function adequately to help women who are oppressed by the institution. It would have been extremely difficult and probably impossible for me to get an appropriate teaching position anywhere in this country if I had not won this battle. However, this kind of charismatic event does not manage to bring about permanent institutional change."

while another respondent feels that there is still hope:

> "My strategies have thus far only made it possible for me to survive and function at this institution. They have not as yet been effective in changing attitudes or behavior...but I still have hope."

But many women also see a combination of effects of their participation in protest activities. One of these is consciousness-raising for those women seeking change

and a sense of camaraderiesship which may bring about the desired and hoped-for change,

> "There is a problem, of course, in maintaining spirit. Occasionally setbacks unite us; at other times they weaken us. All in all I think women have benefitted in that we respect each other more, know each other better, even though CHANGES in hiring practices, salary schedules have not. In other words, our values have been aired - they go far beyond job titles and money. They suggest a complete revolution - a feminist revolution which cannot be 'bought off.'"

while another is consciousness-raising for the entire academic community where some visible changes have taken place. Here is one such example following the conclusion of hearings where the results are still pending:

> "Whatever the ultimate disposition of the complaints, the impact on the college has been enormous. The hearings were very well attended by students, faculty at all levels, and alumnae in the area; they were also written up in the local papers. What emerged tended to solidify and in some cases give voice for the first time to felt discrimination at the college among the students, faculty and staff, cooks and maids, etc. There is strong support to find a woman president; this fall a committee of the faculty on the status of women at the college will be formed; a committee studying tenure policy has been put under strong pressure to come with some real reforms in the system. The college has been put on the spot to defend its concern with women and to say what it has done to promote women's self-image, etc. The most interesting result, however, has been the demise of the college dean and her replacement by a known sympathisizer with women's causes...

The appearance of a "known sympathizer with women's causes" in the above example is illustrated in another rare example of concrete action involving an entire university system where an academic woman actively protesting sex discrimination in her professional association was appointed to a cabinet-level administrative position. Her task was to conduct an extensive study of sex discrimination in the entire system with the accompanying mandate to assume the responsibility of implementing the report's recommendations. In still another case the visible changes following settlement of a suit were limited, but the still-employed protestor performed an important function:

> "I've been cited as a precedent in several other battles for tenure for women there, and a few of them got it. It has greatly improved my own feminist consciousness."

Sometimes the sensitizing takes an unexpected course with mixed results:

> "As a result of the hassling the Department decided that they needed to hire after all, and they drew up a new job, altering the job specifications so that they would have a rationale for not considering me. Hundreds of applications poured in, for people were interviewed by the department - All of them WOMEN. Quite a shift in behavior for the all-male department! Not surprisingly, perhaps, the weakest of the four women were hired."

The above quotation also raises the question as to whether institutional resistance (or threats to professional competence) may lower academic standards when the most qualified women are refused appointments.

In another situation the feminist may be able to insure a degree of self-protection, but not much institutional change:

> "I believe that most of my colleagues here are quite aware of my position on 'women's' issues and would be less likely to take any overt sexist actions towards me than towards other women. Unfortunately, I do not think I have been very successful in removing barriers that exist for other women here."

Part of the reason for the lack of substantial change towards equalizing employment opportunities and conditions of work for academic women is that good faith efforts have not been made to introduce and implement Affirmative Action Plans according to the suggested guidelines:

> "The impact on the university is heartbreakingly minimal. The department continues the policies and attitudes which contributed to my discriminatory experiences, apparently feeling that after the settlement with me their consciences were now clear and they could revert to the status quo. I find it inconceivable that they will ever hire a woman faculty member. We have a woman Affirmative Action Officer now on campus, who is intelligent and personable, but she has no tenure at the university, she works only part-time on affirmative action and has no staff or telephone facilities to assist her, and her position with respect to hirings and promotions is advisory only, all of which seems inadequate to effect significant change in this most recalcitrant institution."

The unbending rule of departmental autonomy evidently subjugates even administrators who are responsible for the equalizing process in affirmative action:

> "The only cases I've seen in which the individual woman involved in such a case comes out unscarred is where some higher body in the university takes up her cause against the department - and that is pretty rare. But typically, after a few female casualties, most departments seem to go on to hire their 'good' woman."

But part of the reason for lack of change may be attributable not so much to lack of good faith efforts or ignorance but rather to the refusal of some administrators to listen to the protestors and to heed the recommendations of their own faculty:

> "The Chancellor never answered us directly but acted instead, prodded no doubt by the letters that had been sent out by the two women's groups to the Regional Office of HEW, the ASA Committee on Women, the judge trying the suit, the campus Affirmative Action Officer, etc. What the administration did was to squash the department's recommendations so that nobody was hired."

Another reason may be that inadequate controls exist to curb sex discrimination because of its pervasiveness in academia, and trustees are not the only derelicts:

> "The problem is that the AAUP is good in supporting complaints by faculty members against the administration of their institutions. When it comes to sex discrimination, however, the faculty is just as guilty as the administration and the AAUP is unwilling to investigate itself."

Outright refusal to accept the principle of tenure and to comply with a positive finding of a government investigation may be yet another reason:

> "I was 'fired' in spite of my tenure in July. The findings from HEW were positive, but after the university refused to comply with my demands, I also filed under state law with FEPC."

And finally, the reasons academic women may have been unable to effect change is that they have had to confront overwhelming obstacles:

> "I believe that the only thing that will stop our oppression is the progressive transformation of all the institutions - of all the people. I cannot stop the university and I cannot change it. I do not believe that any of us can change the institutions in which we exist - personally. In my five years here I did a lot to transform the university by transforming the students. But the people in my department found me threatening because I was different from them - because I was revolutionary and this threatened them. They didn't like me as a woman - they held me responsible for their wives' interest in liberation, they found me threatening to their own marriages and generally to their own lives - professional and personal. I believe that any woman who threatens the power of men at a university will be fired unless she's such a big shot that they can't, and then they will just punish her in different ways. People who are addicted to control cannot allow any kind of freedom from their own values. I believe you need to have a deep sense of anger and a great desire to fight under all kinds of attacks in order to deal with a university because they are powerful and just wear you out."

Institutional change is slow. When the institution happens to be academia, change appears to be exceptionally slow, according to most respondents. One woman alone, and even groups of women, still encounter overwhelming odds to turn the tide. The abuse of power goes uncontrolled, and other long over-due academic reforms, which would benefit the entire academic community, are still to come. At most, the protesting women may have begun to prick the consciences of those who would deny them an equal share in the academic rewards, to introduce some revisions in grievance procedures, and to widen the arena of support towards achieving sex equality, if not on their own campuses, at least elsewhere in the society.

Our investigation shows an increasing commitment of protesting women in the women's movement, despite the shattering impact which the experience has had on many

of their lives and careers. Often unwittingly, they have placed themselves in the vanguard of changing the status of all academic women. Eventually, they may even succeed in converting the tokenism of the present to an institutional structure which enhances, rather than undermines, the very essence of higher education's purpose.

IV. ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND FAILURES: AN ANALYSIS[3]

Thus far we have identified and discussed four response patterns of academic women to sexism and sex discrimination and have indicated briefly the effects of this experience on their own lives and their institutions. In the course of this survey we have presented portions of the accounts of these protesting women which typify the experiences of others. Our analysis, however, was focused more on the process of stratagems and counter stratagems than on the outcome of this process for achieving sex equality. Of course, we are neither concerned nor able to pass judgment as to whether and to what extent the grievances of the victims are justified. But it behooves us now to attempt an assessment of the gains and losses deriving from the protesting women's stratagems and speculate on the underlying forces of each of the response patterns. Such an evaluative analysis will lead to some concluding remarks concerning the efforts of academic women to effectuate reform in higher education and also permit us to make a few recommendations for further action.

A. Ideological Pronouncements

According to our respondents, deliberate efforts to sensitize academia are likely to be quite successful. Thus, incidents such as refusing to serve coffee or

---

[3]It is likely that our convenience sample may be over-represented with respondents who had unsuccessful experiences. Since there is no way of ascertaining whether and how extensive such possible bias may be, it would be inappropriate to draw quantitative inferences about the state of affairs on a nation-wide basis. On the other hand, there seems to be sufficient evidence to draw inferences about questionable administrative practices followed by a good number of educational institutions. For it is important to note that each informer reports a case which very frequently involves several women and the whole or a good part of the bureaucratic apparatus on her campus, and sometimes includes an entire state-wide campus system.

being a secretary in committee meetings, disapproving sexist remarks in lectures, demonstrating that academic women can be both mothers and professors, and teaching courses on women may effectively change values and attitudes about sex roles in general, and about their own roles as academic women in particular.

The respondents also feel that their attempts to expose sex discrimination on the campuses across the country have raised the consciousness of other members of the academic community, as well as their own. Committees and other groups of women air the same issues and problems with reports and resolutions for equal treatment and equal opportunity for women on the campus. Younger male colleagues are more open and willing to discuss sex discrimination as an existing problem. And despite some male backlash and scorn by some faculty women who "never felt discriminated against," most administrators acknowledge the existence of sex discrimination and promise to correct inequities.

The point I would like to make here is that neither sensitizing nor consciousness-raising efforts are likely to be resented (at least openly), since they are perceived as ideological pronouncements in the current wave of the feminst movement. After all, institutions of higher learning are supposed to be the citadels of such virtues as tolerance and fair play, learning and teaching the truth, and, above all, freedom to express one's own ideas. Moreover, such idealistic pronouncements are tolerated - in fact, often publicly promulgated - as long as they are not accompanied by requests for correcting specific inequities requiring funds, do not question traditional policies and practices, and especially do not demand changes in established decision-making channels and centers of power.

B. Campus Politics

This sense of successful accomplishments fades away as idealistic pronouncements are followed by requests for correcting grievances with respect to employment and professional status. Then the grievance process is no longer purely ideological in character, It leaves the idealistic sphere and becomes essentially a political movement with academic women seeking a share in the power held by males in a male-

dominated system. Within this context, the fortunes of academic women may frequently and to a considerable degree depend on campus politics rather than on academic credentials or competency.

This is an interesting and highly significant proposition. Of course, no one can know with certainty the role which campus politics may have played in each of the reported cases; and our pilot survey was not designed to test such a hypothesis. We can only draw some concluding observations inductively; and the pattern of successes and failures seems to suggest an interpretation of events consistent with our proposition.

Individual grievances may involve several administrative levels, including the president or chancellor. But at this first stage of the grievance process complaints are handled and usually resolved at the departmental level, for it is here that judgment on matters relating to the academic discipline is passed. But when the complainants are women who claim sex discrimination, in most cases they are successful in seeking redress to their grievances for reasons unrelated to the professional prerogatives vested in the department. In other words, now the norms of departmental autonomy may or may not be operative, including adherence to customary procedures for evaluating the professional competence of the protesting woman. Let us look first at some illustrative cases which report correction of inequities where professionalism is irrelevant to the attainment of success and where decisions are made on the basis of non-academic criteria.

The process begins in the male-dominated graduate and professional schools where women aspiring to academic careers find that the last lap of their training assumes highly personalistic proportions with male professors seeking sexual favors and subjecting female candidates to unnecessary tests of endurance not accorded males before giving the nod for the sought-after degree. Despite the disadvantaged position in which these women find themselves, some refuse to pay the price, but others find it easier to do so.

Once having secured the proper credentials and entered the academic marketplace, a woman is confronted with similar practices if not the same forms. The success

achieved by the women in the two cases of nepotism was not at all attributable to the customary privilege of the department to judge the woman's worth on ground of professional competence alone. In the one case the wife was hired after the husband resigned; then the husband was rehired and both got tenure. The stratagem worked because the obvious evasion of the nepotism rule had been 'abandoned at nearby institutions' and because 'helpful in overturning the rule were the concerted efforts of women in my department' and, furthermore, because 'their strong feelings...were heard by a sympathetic department chairman." Here again, success occurred because the criteria were not academic. Also, consider the woman who insisted that pregnancy was no reason for being refused re-appointment. Again, the pregnancy issue had such obviously sexist overtones that noone could argue openly that being pregnant might impair her teaching effectiveness.

Stratagems unrelated to professional criteria appear to be successful even in cases where women are denied redress to their grievances on grounds of alleged lack of professional qualifications. This point is demonstrated in the case of the respon... who was denied promotion because of "teaching incompetence" on the basis of using a "non-academic text." The faculty decision was overruled by the president of the college because of the threatened adverse publicity. The two important points in this case are that the alleged teaching incompetence was based on very shaky grounds, and the non-academic consequences of adverse publicity were considered to be more serious than the use of an unacceptable text.

More often, however, the excuse of professional incompetence is inferred rather than explicitly stated. Consider the respondent who decided to fight after two years during which time she had tried "to peacefully negotiate within the department... power inequities made my bargaining position weak," and "the final discriminatory act was the department's recommendation to the president that I be replaced." Although the question as to whether or not power inequities necessitated her replacement must remain unanswered, the fact is that in the period of two years no evidence could be produced of incompetency - the only valid excuse for denial of her demands for equitable treatment. It thus became necessary to avoid the professional issue

altogether, and the woman's persistence and "troublemaking" nature was used against her in the all-male department. One such predicament is enough to place the department on its guard, necessitating careful screening of other potential female candidates for any proclivities to protest activities. For once competent women are hired, it is difficult to find believable excuses to turn down their demands. This would include part-time employees who might eventually seek "regular" positions, as well as women requesting promotions and salary raises.

The sovereignty of departmental professionalism is vividly portrayed in the case of another respondent. Although the minority of a department favored her appointment to "a job opening with specifications fitting" her qualifications, the "department was successful in claiming that they had no position available." Neither the Dean of Women nor the other college organizations, including the college union supporting her appointment, could "budge the department." It appears that academic qualifications, no matter how impressive they may be, do not help re-employment of a woman who dares to expose the inequities of sex discrimination. In another example, despite the qua - fications and proven competence of the part-time woman who attempted to legitimize her de facto full-time status, she was not only humiliated by being required to re-apply for the available position, but she was also threatened with denial of prospective tenure (and thus permanent employment) by the department chairman which her new status on the "tenure track" would command. Evaluative criteria based on competence were clearly subverted in both these cases where the women were attempting to get "both feet in the door."

There are other cases of academic women using the "channel approach," some reporting successes and some failures, such as the case of the president granting promotion and tenure "several months after the terminal contract was issued," and the two cases of authorship where the response content does not give us any clues to substantiate or refute our proposition. We cannot deny the presence of other considerations, including the possibility that all the women met the professional standards of the department. Neither can we deny the fact that the administrators involved in these cases acted in a spirit of cooperative rather than adversary relationship. But the

consistency of the response pattern of successfully resolved grievances is striking and seems to support our proposition that proper credentialism and competence are accorded far less significance in the decision-making process for women than are factors having nothing to do with possession of the necessary qualifications. This may also be true for men if we accept the oft-discussed premise that the "buddy system" is indeed an academic reality. Be that as it may, because academic women also tend to be as qualified and productive, and often more so, than their academic male peers, the norms related to academic competence somehow become less salient in order to justify maintenance of the status quo. It may be that the woman who insists on equal treatment is judged more harshly than the one who does not complain or indulge in feminist activities. The backgrounds and achievements of our respondents suggest that some extremely talented women are rejected in the hiring process or denied tenure because of the triple threat they pose to male colleagues: competence, strong self-images and assertiveness, and commitment to women's rights. The academic feminist who states succinctly, "I believe in my intelligence, abilities, and values and will continue to struggle for them" is likely to encounter further career obstacles than she is presently experiencing.

By comparison, those cases which report partially or totally unsuccessful redress to grievances seem to involve issues related to professional departmental prerogatives. The consistency of the response pattern of unsuccessfully resolved grievances seems to support our proposition that campus politics rather than academic credentials may determine the fortunes of academic women more frequently than for men.

It is important to realize that in some schools departmental sovereignty may present a serious dilemma to administrators above the departmental level. Barring overt or provable sex discriminatory departmental decisions, they must maintain the professional and non-politically motivated image of the department. Even with sincere intentions to correct sex-oriented inequities, they are frequently unable to determine where professionalism ends and departmental politics begin. At any rate, even if they do realize that a departmental decision is politically motivated, they must

carefully weigh the consequences of their course of action lest overruling a departmental decision creates more problems than condoning sex-discriminating departmental decisions. In many cases, however, it appears that administrators with no intention of correcting sex-related inequities may flagrantly violate basic professional and civil rights. For they can very effectively use departmental autonomy as a convincing pretense and as a formidable political weapon to deny legitimate and justifiable requests.

Admittedly, the presence of political considerations in resolving individual grievances at the departmental level may not be very clear in many cases. By contrast, campus politics seems to dominate the scene in cases involving group grievances. Then sex discrimination is a campus-wide issue, usually involving administrators above the departmental level and frequently the president. Thus "the administration has been hostile: our records were 'looked at' to see if we were troublemakers"; divisive tactics are common, appearing as pronouncements of "equity and fairness" to "both sexes" or as statements to create "anti-feminist hostility" among males; members of bona fide and duly appointed faculty committees on the status of women are intimidated; and if a feminist happens to be in charge of a duly approved faculty program, the whole administrative apparatus is geared to ignore or undermine her efforts. At this point all these tactics and many more may be used if the administration of a school, and the president or chancellor in particular, have no intention of correcting sex-related inequities.

C. Confrontation: What Has Gone Wrong?

The widening of the conflict to include people outside the campus grievance process and academic networks - government officials, lawyers, judges, and ad hoc women's groups and other organizations - intensifies the campus politics of the second response pattern. For filing a complaint or taking a case to court constitutes a critical point for both the academic woman and her adversaries; and winning or losing the case has more serious implications for both. For the woman, her act of defiance means that her entire academic career may hang in the balance. For the administrator, he must ultimately assume complete responsibility for the financial

and repuatational outcome deriving from the woman's actions and his own response. In short, he must now give this matter serious thought and time and he must make an important decision as to whether he intends to pursue a hard-line strategy or to make some move towards resolution of the grievance. It is likely that at this point he may also derive some idea as to how far he can go with the local compliance agency where the complaint has been filed.

1. Administrative Resistance.

Our responses indicate that most administrators who have resisted the protestors prior to their filing complaints continue to do so. Nevertheless, an assessment of the situation and its implications for their own positions, together with the unwelcome prospect of a government investigation, prompts some administrators to move towards resolving the complaint. The road taken tends to be cautious, leading us to conclude that they are simply attempting to placate the complaining woman while using a brushfire or "token" strategy to the whole problem. In other words, any "success" achieved by the protesting woman is limited to full-time rather than part-time workers and to the recruitment of new faculty at lower ranks, and more often involves small salary "adjustments" rather than promotions, especially the achieving of tenure. For example, there is the administrator's attempt to quiet the woman with "an insulting $15 a month adjustment," while at the same time giving several other women "very low salary adjustments"; there is "some lip service" through hiring several women who were "mostly token appointments"; there is the case in which "the part-time women filing the complaint with HEW lost but women in the 'regular' positions won"; and the case in which "HEW could not 'protect' me because the guidelines do not cover 'part-time workers.'" Thus we see that whatever gains are achieved by academic women are not only of token proportions, but they are also unplanned for future years and also considered to be grossly unfair. In fact, "success" is only a temporary move grudgingly made towards resolution of a larger grievance which is under consideration for further action at some unstipulated future time. We see that tenure and full professorial status are the forbidden

fruit for women who have been long overdue for such merit. And we see that the disadvantages of working part time in academia are increased manyfold since such employees are denied even their constitutional right to protest inequitable treatment. In the light of this evidence, prospects for more positive changes appear dim and continued exploitation of academic women looms large during the present period of academic hard times.

A closer look at this experience reveals another pattern. While others gain, the woman filing the complaint seldom does. The same is true of women filing jointly. In fact, not only do protesting women become the sacrificial lambs, but they may also find themselves, unexpectedly and in varying degree, the objects of some kind of reprisal. "There has been no action in my case" may or may not gladden the heart of one losing woman, but another who says that "much has changed for other women, but I am unemployed" is clearly unhappy. It is one thing to see somebody benefit, but quite another to be the one who is punished for having rocked the boat. Retaliation for having filed a complaint is even used against organized women's groups who file class complaints. "The group strategy was very effective, except that at least one of the women involved is no longer at the university," and "most of the women who were associated with the complaint were not called to teach again," are only two of the many examples voicing this concern. But backlash may strike at all the women on any one campus, even those not involved in a complaint or suit: "Since we wrote our initial report and filed the complaints, the salary gap between men and women faculty has widened," and "men with my qualifications have been promoted but no women." Finally, the painful lesson is learned by a few women who decide to throw in the shovel: "Should I obtain another job, I plan to conform and take it."

One important conclusion to be drawn from the above is that some college and university administrators exert all the power at their command towards winning the case, annihilating the "troublemaker," or at least keeping her in her place. How can we explain this continued resistance to resolving grievances?

First, the administrator may be unwilling to assess carefully the costs of

continuing discrimination as against the costs of correcting inequities. Our evidence does not seem to support the rationale that the prime intent is to keep the Pandora's box shut. Compliance in affirmative action does not entail a massive and instant re-ordering of financial priorities. Assuming that the correction of inequities is inevitable through affirmative action or other legal mandates, sanctions, and continuing pressure from various groups, in many cases the cost of resisting even one complainant is so heavy that it cannot be explained. Administrators seem willing to spend large sums of money, also measured in time, to fight their own employees by convening endless committees, hiring expensive lawyers, and covering up their true intentions in a variety of ways, including rewarding the wrong women, setting up ineffective offices for women's issues (including Affirmative Action offices), all the while publicizing their commitment to women's rights. Nor can the rationalization be accepted that some males are also discriminated against and that upgrading women fosters reverse discrimination: affirmative action does not even pretend to benefit women to the detriment of men.

A second reason for administrative failure may lie in the fact that many academic executives lack the managerial skills to handle problems as complex as those emanating from sex discrimination. The task of integrating an already available, highly educated and skilled labor subgroup into a system where both the places and the rewards are scarce requires an understanding of human dynamics as well as knowlege about organizational behavior and academic disciplines. Our respondents speak frequently of improper handling of their grievances; of the lack of procedural channels for fair hearings; of the unclear criteria for hiring, promotion, and tenure; and of shifting policies on employment practices. On some campuses institutional machinery for minimizing strains is not even in existence, and it has often taken a case of sex discrimination to begin building such machinery. "The university was compelled to create committees to deal with the problem." Thus, even efforts towards resolution which may be made in good faith may be undermined because inadequate procedures exist for pursuing grievances, and planning seems to be makeshift or ephemeral. Such administrative practices attest to gross mismanagement in our

institutions of higher education.

Closely tied to lack of good management is the inability of administrators to understand the nature of sex discrimination complaints, let alone appreciate the magnitude of the consequences for failing to comply. Ignorance of legal implications may frequently be the other side of managerial inexperience, partially explaining the brushfire solution to problems of sex inequality. For the movement has created new problems never encountered before.

But all these plausible explanations may in many instances not be sufficient to explain the numerous administrative malpractices, aberations, and near "social crimes." Sexist attitudes may be an important explanation of situations which sometimes seem to amount to "little Watergates." Authority has been challenged by a woman in an institution where obedience is required of all. Protesting women seem to be judged more harshly than protesting men. In open confrontation conflict appears to be reduced to personal terms; many cases suggest strongly that such is indeed the situation. Thus, reprisals are even more severe for women who venture outside the channels of administrative authority, publicize their defiance, and otherwise engage in the disobedient and ungrateful acts of a "bad girl." We have seen throughout our cases involving government agencies or courts that administrators are flagrantly violating or openly flouting both the spirit and the letter of the law; their arrogance seems to have no limits. They use retaliatory measures to suppress the protestors: lies, ostracism, false charges and false witnesses in kangaroo courts, character assassination, divisive tactics, intimidation and harassment, and institutional violence sometimes reaching brutal force. Could it be that the achievement of equality for academic women also threatens the male strongholds for high-level administrative positions for women, including college presidencies? Further, could it also be that the achievement of equality for academic women may even go so far as to threaten all the traditional institutional arrangements through which knowledge is acquired and perpetuated, including questioning the very content of knowledge itself? Otherwise, how can one explain the fierce resistance to all the changes necessary to effectuate equality and guarantee a fair and democratic climate for all

members of the academic community?

2. Ineffectiveness of the Government Agencies.

What part does the government agency vested with the authority to investigate complaints, demand compliance, and impose sanctions on offending institutions have in these largely unsatisfactory results? Our respondents are nearly unanimous in their indictment of government agencies. They have failed to conduct reviews of campuses and to call for Affirmative Action Plans; they have not followed through to see if plans were properly drawn up and implemented according to official guidelines; they have kept plans secret from the complainants concerning what is taking place between agency and educational institution. And (except for some threats), no agency has yet to withhold government funds from a college or university, and this despite demonstrated failure, often over years of time, to resolve cases. Thus administrators have been encouraged to continue policies of tokenism, making a mockery of laws and statutes prohibiting sex discrimination. "I filed charges with HEW, EEOC, and FEPC" and "there has been no investigator here as yet" and "so far very little has happened," is a common lament among our respondents. Procrastination, coupled with wasted time and energy, frozen employment status, unfriendly or deteriorating relationships with colleagues, and gloomy prospects for a productive and satisfying career under a hostile administration, soon takes its toll. So most protestors find that any redress to their grievances is not worth the effort.

On the other hand, our respondents also indicate in rare instances that whenever the agencies act, so usuallydo the administrators. Thus, despite the foot-dragging of government officials investigating discrimination, when the agency takes some action, no matter how feeble or feigned, there is a good likelihood that some counteraction will be sparked on campus. But at precisely what point decisive and meaningful redress to grievances for the complaining faculty woman will take place seems to vary from one campus to the next. For example, the catalytic event towards at least partial compliance or resolution of a particular complaint might occur when an Affirmative Action Plan is requested or turned down, and it might occur when the agency

institutes a class action suit. Thus, "a representative" from "the local Department of Labor Office" walked into the personnel and payroll office," "our Deans consulted with the head of our Affirmative Action Office," and "senior women in particular have benefitted"; and, in another case, "I was given a $1,750 raise for 1973" with the "pressure brought by HEW" which also "encouraged the hiring of a few women faculty."

It is important to stress that government action in these typical examples has produced only partial and temporary results (the salary raise in the last example is for one year only) with the administrator making the gesture to deal with the complaint rather than by order of the agency. Thus we can question whether the agencies even define their functions as compelling compliance. But other explanations rather than dereliction of duty are possible, and further research must confirm the present findings. One explanation is that agency intervention is strongly resisted so that other than totally ignoring the agency, the administrator in effect defies it with token compliance: "Their Affirmative Action Plan to hire more women has not brought significant numbers of women to campus." Another is that the government officials themselves use the same hard line which the administrators use: it may be that these officials, working in bureaucratic organizations where sex discrimination is also institutionalized and where priorities must be established between racial and sex discrimination or in terms of time allotted to cases are perfectly content to back up the non-complying administrators and allow them to stall or make only small improvements. It is also suggested that some agency officials may even bend over backwards to be accommodating if a good record is made on the racial front. A few of our respondents suggest open collusion. And, finally, maybe the problem - or the protesting woman - will go away in due time, since there is always the prospect of her finding employment elsewhere to take the heat off the entire problem for everyone. The agency's excuse of allowing "internal procedures" to eventually straighten things out (in essence the equivalent of AAUP's "due process") can only be called another delaying tactic and de facto makes the compliance officials adversary partners with administrative officials against academic women having no power whatsoever. Otherwise, it is difficult to give any other explanation as to why some women are compelled

to wait two and even three years after filing complaints before any final action is taken.

We should not pass over lightly any evidence, no matter how scant, which shows a final judgment rendered by a government agency in favor of a protesting woman. For we need to know the circumstances of the case for the purpose at hand and also its significance for the women's movement generally.

In one of the rare cases reported of a successful resolution of a case (in which the complainant was satisfied) by a state-based agency trying its first sex discrimination case, the agency's decision to override the resisting university administration appears to be based on an extraordinarily "strong" case. "My promotion was recommended by a department committee, the chairman, and dean" and because "I had top priority in the department and number two priority in the School of Liberal Arts (17 departments)." If the notion of academic "superwoman" qualifies women for promotions, we may question why other cases are not brought to completion with equally favorable action. Protesting academic women make sure that they can produce the hard facts needed to prove the discrimination against them. They also make sure that they are not professionally vulnerable, even to the point of being "over-qualified" (also cause for rejection in hiring) before bucking the system with complaints to government agencies or to the courts. "I have published ten papers and presented another ten and have won a commendation for excellence in teaching" and "(I have) four books and a number of articles in the best sociology journals" are typical statements of women who protest inequities. Their vitas also attest to their publishing accomplishments.

Yet we have also seen a few cases where government agencies have completed investigations, even going so far as to take cases to hearings in some instances, but still with no final decisions. If the work has been completed, what is holding them up? Assuming that such "progress" is indicative of earnest efforts to bring complaints to a logical and just conclusion, it is possible that much of the administration's case rests on academically debatable issues (e.g., professional competence for receiving tenure), so that the government officials may be reluctant to make a final judgment. We have seen how non-professional criteria are introduced for refusing a woman's

demands before she seeks government action. But professional incompetence constitutes the only logical grounds for denying the complainant's demands when the complaint reaches an agency or a court. Administrative strategies to create dilemmas for the government officials concerning the pros and cons for granting tenure or promotion to full professorial rank makes it more comfortable for the agency to stand clear of the controversies in judging academic qualifications. Even when neutral "experts" are brought in from outside the campus to pass judgment on the woman's publications, any disagreement about the quality of her performance compounds the confusion for the compliance officials lacking similar academic backgrounds. Thus, there must be a clear mandate for rendering a favorable decision to the protesting woman, as the above case shows. If administrators succeed in raising doubts about a woman's competence as their only defense, a case can be laid to rest only through a compromise solution between complainant and administration. Such a settlement made in terms of a one-shot salary "adjustment," with all the other issues of the case remaining unresolved, seems to be the usual ending for those few of our respondents reporting final outcomes of their cases with government agencies. The administrator is given the benefit of the doubt. At the same time, by throwing the rest of the individual's grievances into the process called Affirmative Action, the compliance agency can conveniently terminate its concern with the case, and the charging complainant(s) may have to begin all over again. One individual who had reached a "victory" says, "So far I have had the offer of reinstatement and $47,000. But this does not cover rem s for my complaints of past discrimination"; a member of a group filing together says, "Many women were given raises above the 5.5% standard increases everyone was given. We were also given raises (the chargees) but no promotions, tenure, back pay, etc."; while the respondent speaking of a class action complaint says, "We are still hard at work, etc."

For despite the nudging effect which the concept of Affirmative Action may have on many campuses, it is also a process which can remain in a state of perpetual development and never reach the promised land. Administrative promises of mending one's academic ways through establishing Affirmative Action Offices, appointing

officers to head them, conducting comprehensive studies, etc., not only releases the agency from any further commitment to individual or group complaints, but also virtually guarantees that the government funds will never be withheld in such an endless endeavor. Academia lacks a precedent such as that which occurred in the business world when EEOC used its enforcement powers to compel payment of $38 million in back pay and increases to women and minority male employees of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. And "the university is still dragging its feet in formulation of an affirmative action plan." Do government agencies encounter more difficulties in judging academic cases because of their nature, or are they more sympathetic towards college and university organizations than towards "big business" establishments?

3. Lack of Precedence in Law.

The present early stage of the women's movement leaves much for speculation as to the outcome of cases brought to court by protesting women finding no solutions elsewhere. Although many of our respondents indicate legal suits among their actions, none report any final court judgment which would set the stage for other cases.

There seems to be little doubt, however, that law suits are treated more seriously by administrators than are complaints with government agencies. Even the threat of a law suit apparently has an effect on some administrators who decide at that point not to commit the institution's funds and other resources towards meeting the expenses of litigation. This may explain the "substantial" results which one group of women obtained because of the "protection of having a suit in litigation in a federal court." A particularly strong case for an individual complainant may also be a deterrent to pressing a case in court.

Notwithstanding the presence of such deterrents, our study shows that some administrators continue to follow their hard-line strategy. A pending law suit may not encourage an out-of-court settlement. Again, it may be that asministrators and their attorneys depend on the issue of competence to provide sufficient opportunity to cloud up the complainant's case, and certainly they can depend on financial resources.

Of course, the most important consideration in law suits is that precedents are

set for future cases. But until such precedents are established, for the present even a restraining order is treated with great fanfare by the complainants and their supporters as news travels swiftly from campus to campus and is publicized in the women's and other news media.

D. Where Sisterhood Counts

Although our purpose was to study the process of protest on campuses, a brief assessment of our respondents' experiences outside academia is relevant to our analysis. For we have attempted to answer the question posed at the beginning of this report as to why academic women have not shown any noticeable successes at effectuating reform on their own campuses and departments but have made some good beginnings elsewhere. Progress is noticeable in their professional associations where some visible changes in participation have taken place through their activism in the women's caucuses and advisory groups.

But we have also seen that many of the other activities in which academic women utilize their skills have already borne fruit in one or another ways with the full potential yet to be reached. Displaced anger and growing consciousness have witnessed the increasing involvement of academic women in intellectual and political activities mainly through their organizational affiliations away from their places of work. These women's organizations have provided a local and immediate source of support which the national professional groups have had more difficulty in providing. One possible outcome is that some of the growing consciousness and commitment obtained through membership may be transferred to the campus itself. Some of our respondents have indicated that this has already happened. For the strong stand of organizations such as the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL) and the National Organization for Women (NOW) against discrimination in higher education, the complaints filed against hundreds of colleges and universities, and the attention given to pressing claims in the courts on academic issues have no doubt contributed to campus gains.

In other words, sisterhood has been lacking on campus; it was not lacking in the professional women's caucuses and in the other women's organizations where numbers

and common identification in a cause were present. Whatever the cause, lack of sisterhood on campus is an important reason why academic women protesting sex inequities have failed to achieve their goals. Most of our respondents filing individual complaints or suits have stood alone on their campuses and in their departments, even when there were other women present. The disturbing truth is that academic women have yet to help each other to the degree needed to change their own employment opportunities and conditions of work. This occurs despite all the evidence which shows that sex discrimination is blatantly practiced against all the women on campus. And where women have been the lone members of a school or a department, other academic women have not reached across from another department or another school to provide the needed assurance and countervailing power. Most surprisingly, academic women with tenure who have a clear advantage despite their fewer numbers do not extend a helping hand nor take the initiative to mobilize others for joint action. In this respect many academic women seem to follow the typical pattern witnessed among their male colleagues. Those of our respondents who have embraced the concept of sisterhood as the most promising solution are still too few in number to have the impact which strong collective voluntary action would bring. Certainly much of the bitterness and disillusionment expressed by our respondents derives from having to face a strong opposition alone. Ostracism from a community in which peer relationships are the very essence for intellectual stimulation and professional advancement cannot be made up completely away from one's place of work even when sympathetic others are present.

The mere existence of a group of women coordinating their efforts, however, does not in itself guarantee successful results. We have seen how a campus group filing a complaint together were all fired in one case. These were all part-time women with no bargaining power whatsoever. Nor does utilization of every conceivable avenue guarantee positive action. The group of women in a large university who did everything possible to turn the tide on their campus - filed a complaint which "was signed by all the tenured women," used "continual pressure on the agencies to do their job," including contacting a senator, "blasted repeatedly to the local press," tried "block voting at the faculty meetings at which committee members are elected," and hired a

lawyer to file suit in court - were probably not yet a strong enough political force to see change on their campus. Even their connections with the "friendly Dean" who slipped them the data on salaries and other information had failed to bring the sought-after results.

Most attempts to act as groups have yet to see positive results beyond some small successes. But respondents who were involved in group action have viewed themselves as an emerging political force with a potential for change. The consensus was that change was going to take place only through collective action.

V. WHAT DOES THE FUTURE HOLD?

Certainly it is too soon to assess the final outcome of protest for sex equality by academic women on the nation's campuses. Our exploratory efforts to learn what is happening during the early years of the campus movement for reform suggest that at least through the year 1973 attempts to change employment opportunities and conditions of work for academic women have yet to witness anything beyond token and sporadic successes on some campuses. Admittedly, our sample may include some of the most disappointing cases. But it appears that the responses of 45 academic women speaking for almost as many campuses and campus systems leads to the inescapable conclusion that one woman alone or even groups of women cannot easily hope to change the sexist attitudes and effectuate the necessary reforms to improve the status of academic women. Clearly the problem is multi-dimensional and requires multi-dimensional approaches for its solution. Based on our view of these campuses as depicted by a sample of women deeply involved in the movement for sex equality, we can point to a few of the areas where action is needed and suggest both some general and specific ways to confront the problem. Our immediate goal is to help the disrupted careers of the hundreds of academic women who have been encouraged to file complaints. Some are still waiting for determination of their cases and some have already experienced serious adversities in their careers. At the same time, we must begin to remove major obstacles in academia itself which prohibit women from reaching

their full potential as scholars and teachers.

Government Agencies.

1. The government agencies must cease their procrastination and other questionable practices. There is little doubt that the OCR regional offices take their directives from high government levels where foot-dragging is being encouraged and the objectives of affirmative action deliberately subverted. They are not representing the interests of academic women who have filed the complaints but rather the interests of higher education management. Through delays and stalling, they provide administrators with all sorts of excuses to resist women and to support the status quo at a cost of millions of dollars in public money. Since the phrase "within a reasonable period of time" seems to mean that women may have to wait as long as three or more years to have their complaints resolved, one might question the way in which cases are being handled. It should not be necessary to wait for court judgments to verify the extensive damage which is being done to the careers of academic women who file complaints. Also, since there has been sufficient time for all campuses to develop Affirmative Action Plans, these should all be immediately reviewed and a tight implementation schedule established.

2. The government agencies should not ignore the complaints of part-time women who are an important part of the academic labor force. This is a highly discriminating practice which denies women their constitutional rights.

3. An appeals process should be instituted following determination of cases by government agencies or employers which are considered unsatisfactory by complainants. Such appeals should include charges concerning the effects of delays in resolving cases and any accompanying harassment.

4. The secrecy which permeates the entire process of compliance should end. The Departments of Labor and HEW should accumulate and publish data on cases of sex discrimination as systematically as they do for other activities, including follow-ups. Agencies should keep complainants and employers informed of the progress of each case. Furthermore, they should publicize the status of complaints and every Affirmative Action Plan rather than selecting what they consider to be newsworthy.

This could be accomplished on a monthly or other periodic basis. There is also no reason why agencies should not advertise and circulate model plans for other institutions to follow.

5. Agencies should include on their staffs women having academic credentials and experience, in addition to proven commitment to the women's movement. The limitation of higher staff positions to black males not only encourages the setting of unfair priorities in many offices but also shows that sex discrimination is being practiced in the very agencies designated to investigate sex discrimination.

6. If understaffing and budget are indeed problems, additional funds should be put to the task of eliminating backlogs. However, our close view of women involved in cases with HEW and other agencies indicates less a funding problem and more a situation of ignorance about academic institutions and a venerable attitude towards academic employers. One suggestion to offset many of these handicaps would be to establish advisory groups for each compliance office which would include practicing academic women and representatives from women's groups and professional associations, all of whom could help in rendering fairer and speedier judgments of cases.

7. Most importantly, almost six years after Executive Order 11246, it is about time that agencies should begin to impose sanctions on employers who fail to resolve complaints or who are harassing complainants. This means withholding funds for even one individual's case where discrimination has been substantiated and not corrected. To wait for a persisting pattern of discriminati n (usually involving introducing and implementing an Affirmative Action Plan) not only guarantees that penalties will never be imposed but again constitutes a violation of a woman's rights. Agencies should not accept as sufficient evidence of compliance the administrators' practice of making small token gestures ad infinitum. Withholding (not just delaying) funds from even one institution for proven discrimination or harassment against an individual complainant would serve as a much needed example to other institutions and undoubtedly hasten compliance.

Academic Reforms.

1. Consistent and fair policies and practices should be clearly stated for register-

ing all grievances - sex related or not - appealing decisions, and resolving disputes, especially those in which differences of opinion occur in matters of professional competence.

2. Evaluative criteria in hiring, promotion, tenure, and firing should be made more explicit. Such criteria should be made known to all candidates before hiring takes place. Procedures for evaluating teaching and research performances of all the faculty should be established. Criteria for administrative positions should also be pre-determined, and administrators should be evaluated on some regular basis by faculty and staff.

3. All academic and administrative openings should be openly and widely advertised at professional meetings and elsewhere.

4. Except on rare occasions, all non-ladder and non-tenure positions should be eliminated, and part-time employment should command the salaries and other privileges and benefits, as well as the obligations, on some proportionate basis with full-time positions. Campuses still practicing nepotism should immediately abandon such double-standard practices.

5. Decision-making policy should be clearly understood both apart and in relation to affirmative action. Departments should be apprised not only of the Affirmative Action Plan for that particular campus but also of its legal implications. And it goes without saying that they should be involved in its formation.

Professional Associations.

1. The professional associations should investigate grievances of sex discrimination on campuses relative to women in their own disciplines and exert pressure wherever needed, including censure, for the correction of inequities and for other unprofessional or unethical conduct against women. The latter would include cases where (a) co-authorship is denied without basis, (b) degrading connotations are given to introductory or other courses through assignment to women only, (3) differential standards based on sex are applied to faculty teaching, publications, and graduate student examinations, (d) dissertation topics related to women are refused, and (e)character assassination and other questionable tactics are used to debase academic

colleagues at hearings or elsewhere.

2. In addition to keeping and publicizing the statistics of women's participation in schools and departments, the professional associations should urge scholarly attention to the sex variable in all the research conducted in the profession and discourage and even condemn productivity which reinforces sex stereotypes or demeans women in the discipline's literature. This task should not be left to women's committees but should be systematically confronted as a major problem in the profession. The suggestion is included here as only one of several ways in which the professional organizations can change unfavorable attitudes of college professors, especially those who write and assign sexist articles and books to their classes.

3. The professional associations should set up guidelines to help departments establish and deal with the evaluative criteria mentioned above relative to recruitment and advancement in the profession. A few of the questions which may be confronted are as follows: (a) should lack of a Ph.D. degree deny tenure or other merit or opportunities to teach in graduate or summer programs, (b) what are the best teaching methods for the particular discipline, (c) what constitutes excellence in research and writing, and (d) how many publications and in what journals makes a scholar in the field? Although there may not be definite answers, these and related questions are raised over and over again in the experiences of our respondents. Each profession must begin to grapple with them since they speak to central issues of both professional standards and credentialism. Unanswered, they not only encourage manipulation, but they also reinforce strongholds of buddy systems and elitism which make it virtually impossible for academic women to receive equal treatment.

4. If some of the above suggestions appear to be non-feasible for national associations to confront and administer positive action, it may be that some of the work should be undertaken on regional, state, or local levels where such arrangements are not presently in existence. Ways must be found to introduce and enforce professional and ethical codes, whether these codes pertain to sex discrimination or something else.

In conclusion, the present study has shown that women who teach or desire to teach in the nation's colleges and universities have found that quiet, dignified, and reasoned arguments backed by bulky evidence do not easily penetrate the thick walls of prejudice and discrimination. Dissent is not tolerated when it comes from academic women seeking their equal share with their male colleagues. The most disturbing finding has been a lack of real commitment by the campus leadership to respond positively to the appeals of women claiming sex discrimination, thus inviting the intervention of the federal and state bureaucracies. College and university administrators have failed to realize that, at most, affirmative action is but a temporary mechanism designed to help institutions lacking skilled management and favorable attitudes to confront discrimination in some of its more visible dimensions. If the accounts of our respondents concerning the treatment they are receiving because they protest seem exaggerated, the evidence they submit is duplicated from campus to campus across the country, large and small alike. We can only conclude that there is something seriously wrong when those who administer higher education abuse their power by flouting laws and spending millions of dollars fighting women with a personal vindictiveness bordering on cruelty in many cases. Since the ultimate blame must be laid at the door of those who administer our colleges and universities, it is here where a new and different sense of responsibility must emerge to remove both the institutional roadblocks and discriminating attitudes. The task ahead would be infinitely easier if tokenism were to be replaced by genuine good faith efforts to speed the equalizing process for all members of the academic community.

Given the continued resistance by academic administrations, there is now a strong necessity for academic women to coordinate their efforts and to press for the needed changes in a spirit of sisterhood and on a broader scale than has occurred in the past. There is an even greater urgency to reach the women who have been fired, blacklisted, or who are finding their careers in a state of temporary suspension or jeopardy. The complex problems of attacking the bureaucratic [illegible]ncies, inconsistencies, and malpractices of government agencies will dema[illegible]ntinuing and

increasing commitment, skills, and power of the national women's and other large political organizations. The women's groups affiliated with the professional associations must demand that the associations extend their networks of influence and action to the campuses and to their colleagues who need help. And all the other individuals and groups closely connected to the over-all functioning of academia - trustee boards, alumnae, foundations, accrediting boards, legislators, AAUP, and other organizations should be pressured to increase their commitment to changing the status of academic women.